Nov. 12. 1889

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by the Author, Frederic Huidekoper.

BS 2555 .H78 1887 v.1
Huidekoper, Frederic, 1817-
1892.
Works

Shelf.....

WORKS

OF

FREDERIC HUIDEKOPER.

VOLUME I.

JUDAISM AT ROME.

NEW YORK:
DAVID G. FRANCIS.
1887.

JUDAISM AT ROME

B. C. 76 TO A. D. 140.

BY

FREDERIC HUIDEKOPER.

SEVENTH EDITION.

NEW YORK:
DAVID G. FRANCIS.
1887.

Copyright, 1876.
By FREDERIC HUIDEKOPER.

University Press:
John Wilson and Son, Cambridge.

PREFACE.

MANY years ago the writer of this collected some extracts from Christian anticipations of Rome's destruction. While doing this, he noticed that similar views had prevailed among Jews and Romans. Investigation convinced him that the former were the originators. This implied Jewish influence on the Roman mind, which he at first underrated, regarding it as confined to moments of excitement and as affecting merely the populace. Only by degrees did he discover how continuous and powerful it had been, and that it was directly due to the superiority of Judaism over heathenism.

Debarred from night study, the writer has pursued his work amid daily avocations and interruptions. He could have wished to rearrange and revise some portions of it yet further; but to have attempted this might have endangered publication under his own supervision, and would have precluded attention to other duties, and to the completion of another short work which, if eyesight permit, he would thankfully finish.

It seems morally impossible that Judaism and Greek culture, which were driven out with such difficulty from Italy, should have made no impression upon Oriental nations. A remnant of Jews has been found as far east-

ward as China. The moral precepts of Burmah and Siam savor of Judaism.[1] Greeks held intercourse with India long before and after the Christian era.[2]

How far the better features of the Civil or Roman Law resulted from monotheistic influence would be an interesting, and might prove a copious question.

Among suggestions which should have been made in the work is: — that women, equally as men, of the popular party have been grossly maligned by their patrician opponents, who too often were in a position to prevent safe utterance of the truth. On two cases of this, those of Livilla and a granddaughter of Tiberius called the younger Julia, remarks have been offered.[3] Concerning the first Julia, daughter of Augustus, it may be a fair question whether her character also has not been blasted by party policy or malignity.[4]

---

[1] **Malcom** quotes "Five principal and positive [BURMESE] laws: 1. Thou shalt not kill 2. Thou shalt not steal. 3. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 4. Thou shalt not lie. 5. Thou shalt not drink any intoxicating liquor." — *Travels*, 8th edit. p. 189. Cp. Exod. **20**, 13-16; Lev. **10**, 9.

"The king of SIAM recently opened a new mint. . . . The high priest recited the five commands. These are, 'Do not kill; do not steal; do not commit adultery; do not speak falsehood; do not drink strong drink.'" — **Evening Post** (Weekly, N. Y.), January 10, 1877.

[2] Arabic numerals, whether obtained by Arabs direct from India, or at second hand from Greeks, imply communication centuries after the Christian era between India and Western Asia. Montfaucon cites such numerals (*Palaeograph. Græc.* pp. 345, 346) from a Greek manuscript.

[3] Concerning Livilla, see pp. 529, 530, 538; concerning the younger Julia, friend of Pomponia, pp. 241, 518. Julia Sabina, daughter of the patrician idol Titus, was bitterly misrepresented for friendship with her uncle Domitian. The old nurse who at personal risk placed the ashes of uncle and niece together (Sueton. *Domit.* 17) is, by her actions, an unsuspicious witness to their mutual kindness and family affection.

[4] The aristocracy were anxious to put young Antony out of the way. The charge against him was adultery with his cousin Julia. Her father (at that time ruled by patricians) credited, and the popular party discredited, the charge. The language of Philo (*Embassy*, 40) concerning Julia, half a century later, seems unaccountable, if the charges against

On the eve of going to press I learn that Professor Beesly of England, in the "Fortnightly Review" for December, 1867, and January, 1868, treats the account of Tiberius, by Tacitus, as "an elaborate libel." I have no knowledge as to his course of argument.

In a few instances a brief quotation has been repeated, either through inadvertence or to save readers the need of recurring to it.

To Professors Cary of Meadville, and Abbot of Cambridge, my thanks are due for kind offices. The latter, as a labor of friendship, has read many of the proof-sheets, and through his suggestions some errors and oversights have been remedied.

MEADVILLE, PA., September 2, 1876.

In issuing this fifth edition of his work, the author would state that his belief — somewhat cautiously expressed in its pages — as to the monotheistic origin of Greek Culture has become an undoubting conviction.

As regards decadence of civilization in Italy, he would date it from B. C. 18, when the friends of improvement were driven from the Senate, and when that body fell under the control of reactionaries. Thenceforward civilization stood at disadvantage; the law-making power was in the hands of its enemies, the course of society was downwards, and though this tendency met with an occasional check from some of the better emperors, yet within two centuries it landed the community in that ignorance and brutality, that barbarism, which pervaded Italy under Marc Antonine and his son Commodus. To the deification of Augustus a separate heading ought to

---

her found credence in the community where he lived. The unreserved intercourse of cousins may have been seized upon as the means of murdering one and cruelly injuring the other.

have been given. It was a political stroke which greatly aided reactionaries (see p. 7) in murdering the friends of justice and of improvement.

As a literary question the perversion of the Erythræan Verses by Virgil[5] claims attention from teachers of Latin. Those verses — deposited by the Senate in its archives, and of which numerous copies circulated in the community — had proved a thorn in the side of Patricians. In B. C. 12 they collected and burned two thousand copies of them and of their imitations, forbidding any one under death penalty[6] to read them. These verses originated the view that Æneas, a "genuine monotheist," founded the Latin kingdom. The Æneid was intended to transform the "genuine monotheist," the "chaste Æneas," into a licentious pagan, a patron of prize fights and of polytheistic customs. In Virgil's day his intention to parody these verses must have been obvious.[7]

MEADVILLE, PA., November 17, 1882.

---

[5] See pages mentioned in Note A, footnote 21[a], and compare *Indirect Testimony*, p. 82.

[6] See Ch. VII., notes 65, 67, 68.

[7] Six ancient writers (cited in LeMaire's Virgil, vol. **7**, pp. 282, 323, 324) state that Virgil on his death-bed and in his will ordered a destruction of his Æneid. He had doubtless become ashamed of it, knowing, as he must, that it would disgust the improvement party, who, even if they distrusted the Erythræan verses, would not sympathize with a burlesque upon moral teaching. The feeling of that party was perhaps expressed by Caligula (see p. 203, note 55) in his proposal to banish Virgil's busts from public libraries. The author's wishes were disregarded, and his Æneid was published.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

ANCIENT JUDAISM.

Section		Page
I.	Its field for Growth	1
II.	Its First Impediment	2
III.	The Roman Aristocracy its Chief Enemy	5
IV.	They oppose its Associate, Greek Culture	11
V.	Close of Jewish Influence in Europe	14

CHAPTER II.

CAUSES OF JEWISH INFLUENCE.

I.	Chief Causes	16
	1. Jews recognized a Divine Being who took interest in the Moral Education of Mankind	17
	Heathen Deities were regarded as devoid of such Interest	18
	2. The Jewish View of Religious Duties included Morality	20
	Heathen Views did not	25
	3. Future Existence to be hoped if God exercise Moral Care of us, otherwise not	26
	4. The average Character of Jews superior to that of Heathens	27
II.	Accessories and Hindrances	32
	1. Ceremonial Law	32
	2. Offerings for the Temple	33
	3. Popular Rights	35
	4. Relative Antiquity of Monotheism and Idolatry	35
	5. Sibylla	36
	6. Astrology and Soothsaying	38
	7. Mechanical Skill aided Jewish Influence	40
	8. Absence of Political Control; its Effect on Hellenistic Jews	40

CHAPTER III.

JEWISH INFLUENCE ORIGINATES THE STOICS.

I.	Greek Stoics	40
II.	Roman Stoics	54

CHAPTER IV.

JEWISH DIVISION INTO WEEKS.

I. Adopted by Heathens 66
II. Numbering and Nomenclature of the Days 68
III. Lord's Day 70

CHAPTER V.

AFFILIATED QUESTIONS.

I. Public Games 71
II. War 82
III. Annexation and Disintegration 83
IV. Regicide 85
V. Slavery 86
VI. Expensive Living 89
VII. Suppression of Documents 92
VIII. Sympathy of the Jewish with the Roman Aristocracy 96
IX. Murder of Body-Guards 107
X. Two Senatorial Usurpations 108
XI. Herod Agrippa, Senior 112
XII. Insincerity of Patrician Hobbies 114

CHAPTER VI.

BELIEF OF ROME'S IMPENDING DESTRUCTION.

I. As a Precedent of the New Era 116
II. Jewish Expectations 120
Sibylline Oracles 120
Second Book of Esdras 130
III. Roman Apprehensions 134
IV. Views of Jewish and Semi-Jewish Christians . . 135
V. The Roman Emperor as Beliar. Origin of the Conception called Antichrist 137

CHAPTER VII.

CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE, B. C. 76 – A. D. 19.

I. B. C. 76. The Erythræan Verses cause Discussion of Monotheism 141
II. B. C. 75–63. Other Sibylline Verses. King from the East 143
III. B. C. 62–50. Conflict of Parties and Religious Ideas. Cicero a Reactionist 147
IV. B. C. 49. Romans throw away Idol Images during the Passover 151
V. B. C. 44. Cæsar's Death. Cicero disavows Heathenism 154

VI B. C. 43–31. Virgil and Horace. The Oracle at Delphi 156
VII. B. C. 30–18. Patrician Reaction. Virgil burlesques part of the Erythræan Verses 159
VIII. B. C. 18–A. D. 2. Attack on Monotheism and Popular Rights 160
IX. Schools of Law 170
X. A. D. 2–14. Augustus recedes from ultra-Patricianism . 175
XI. A. D. 14–18. Tiberius Emperor. Patrician Steps towards Rebellion 179

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE, A. D. 19–A. D. 70.

I. A. D. 19, 20. Patrician Rebellion. Conversions to Judaism become illegal 186
II. A. D. 21–37. Effects of Patrician Reaction . . . 195
III. A. D. 37–41. Caligula 199
1. His Character 199
2. Order of Events in his Reign 205
3. The alleged Statue for the Jewish Temple 215
IV. A. D. 41–51. Claudius. A Reign of Patricianism and Heathenism 222
V. A. D. 52–54. Expulsion of Jews. Paul in Greece. Claudius as Belial. Philip martyred. Sunday instituted 228
VI. A. D. 54–62. Earlier Years of Nero's Reign . . . 241
VII. A. D. 63–70. Fire at Rome. Jewish War. Persecution of Christians 242

CHAPTER IX.

APOCALYPSE, OR BOOK OF CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

I. Title and Authorship 255
II. Date 258
III. Divisions and Object 259
IV. Phraseology and Illustrations 260
V. Outline of the Book 261

CHAPTER X.

CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE A. D. 70–138.

I. A. D. 70–81. The Reign of Vespasian a Coalition. That of Titus favors Reaction 270
II. A. D. 81–96. Domitian. Expulsion of Monotheism . 275
III. A. D. 96–98. Nerva 286
IV. Position about the Close of the First Century . . 286

1. Senatorial Families 286
2. Corruption of the Judiciary 287
3. Extinction of Oracles discussed by Lamprias . . . 287
4. Effort needed to keep up Belief in Omens . . . 290
5. Public Games 291
6. Social Gatherings and Suppers 293
7. Fashionable Education portrayed in the *De Oratoribus* . 295
8. Vestal Virgins 296
9. Dio Chrysostom sympathizes with Monotheism . . . 297
10. Plutarch indirectly defends it 305
11. Tacitus maligns it 310
12. Pliny, as Tool of Treasury Thieves, persecutes it . . 312
13. Gentile Monotheists 318
14. The Name Christian 319
V. A. D. 98–117. TRAJAN. REACTION AND PERSECUTION . . 320
VI. A. D. 117–138. HADRIAN. JEWISH REVOLT 325

CHAPTER XI.

EFFECTS OF THE JEWISH REVOLT UNDER HADRIAN.

I. DIRECT EFFECTS 330
1. Gnostics, or Anti-Jewish Christians 331
2. Heathen Names affixed to Jewish Documents . . . 336
3. Gentile Evidence substituted for Jewish in Acts of Pilate . 342
4. Embitterment of Semi-Jewish Christians against Jews . 342
II. INDIRECT EFFECTS 344
1. Extravagant Use of the Old Testament 344
2. Antitheses of Irenæus 349
3. Jesus deified as subordinate God of the Old Testament . 349

CHAPTER XII.

CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE, A. D. 138–180.

I. A. D. 138–161. ANTONINUS PIUS 359
II. A. D. 161–180. MARCUS ANTONINUS 360

CHAPTER XIII.

HUMAN CULTURE.

I. MORAL, LITERARY, AND MENTAL 363
II. ÆSTHETIC CULTURE, OR REFINEMENT 371
III. INDUSTRIAL CULTURE 376
IV. GREEK CULTURE A RESULT OF MONOTHEISM 382
V. THE DARK AGES 387

CHAPTER XIV.

MONOTHEISM.

I. Its Origin 388
1. Whether inherent in mankind 388
2. Or due to Reasoning 390
3. Or to Revelation 390
II. Judaism a Preparation for Christianity 394

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

SIBYLLINE BOOKS.

I. Cumæan b. c. 461 – b. c. 83; a Patrician Forgery . . . 395
II. Verses from Erythræ. b. c. 76 402
Part A. Monotheism taught. Heathenism decried . . . 405
B. Mosaic History until the Flood 411
C. Man's History from the Flood until the Rise of Idolatry 412
D. Predictions, professedly, of History during the Continuance of Idolatry 415
E. God's Kingdom 421
F. The Judgment 426
G. Conclusion 431
III. Sibylline Compositions, b. c. 75 – a. d. 200, were Jewish . 434
IV. Christian Compositions were later than a. d. 200 . 441
V. Additional Remarks 446
1. Origin of different Names for Sibylla 446
2. Aristocracy hostile, Monotheism and the Popular Party friendly, to Sibylline Literature 447
3. Sibylline Literature confined at first to Italy . . . 448
4. Its Teaching perverted 448
5. Christians in Second Century claim a non-Jewish Origin for Sibylline Writings 449
6. Causes of present Confusion in Sibylline Productions . 449
7. Verses denouncing Rome are not earlier than b. c. 63 . . 450
8. Copies of Erythræan Verses rare in a. d. 400 . . . 450
9. The supposed Writing on Leaves 450
VI. Patrician Opposition Lines 451
VII. Quotations by Lactantius 453
VIII. A Query concerning Bacis 454
IX. Hystaspes 459

NOTE B.

MEANING OF CERTAIN WORDS.

I. WORDS USED BY JEWS AND CHRISTIANS 460
1. θεοσέβεια 460
2. θεοσεβής 462
3. θεοσεβεῖν 464
4. εὐσέβεια 465
5. εὐσεβής 466
6. εὐσεβεῖν 467
7. ἀσέβεια, δυσσέβεια, ἀνομία 467
8. ἀσεβής, δυσσεβής, ἄνομος 468
9. ἀσεβεῖν 469
10. σέβειν, προσκυνεῖν 469
11. σεβόμενος, φοβούμενος 471
12. δοῦλος 471
13. λαοί 472
II. TERMS APPLIED BY HEATHENS TO JEWS OR CHRISTIANS . 472
1. Foreign Superstition, or Foreign Rites 472
2. ἄθεοι, ἀσεβεῖς 473
3. γένος 474

NOTE C.

DELATORES, — PROSECUTORS ON SHARES 475

NOTE D.

BOOK OF ENOCH.

I. ITS TWO CHIEF OBJECTS 482
II. THE JUDGMENT 483
III. THE PLANETS 484
IV. PUNISHMENT OF ANGELS 484
V. RENOVATION OF THE UNIVERSE BY FIRE 485
VI. SOUL AND SPIRIT 486
VII. PARALLELISM OF THE APOCALYPSE AND BOOK OF ENOCH . 486
VIII. ADDITIONS TO BOOK OF ENOCH 488

NOTE E.

ROMAN CHRONOLOGY 489

NOTE F.

NERO'S RETURN.

I. AS HELD BY ROMANS 491
II. AS HELD BY JEWS 493
III. AS HELD BY CHRISTIANS 499

NOTE G.

TIBERIUS.

I. His Character 504
II. His Retirement to Capreæ 518
III. Patrician Revolt of A. D. 31 522
IV. Social Results of the Rebellion 531
V. Tacitus falsifies History 534

NOTE H.

EGYPTIAN WORSHIP AT ROME 542

NOTE I.

JEWISH REVOLT UNDER NERO.

I. Outline of its Course 545
II. Causes of the Revolt 549
III. Florus 551
IV. Josephus 553
V. Agrippa and Berenice 560
VI. The Christians 560

NOTE J.

TWO MODERN WORKS.

I. Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography . 561
II. Gibbon 561

NOTE K.

XENOPHON, PLATO, AND HERACLITUS.

I. Xenophon 565
1. General Remarks on him and Plato 565
2. His Mention of a Creator 565
3. His Mention of a Providence 566
4. His Argument from Evidence of Design 566
5. He attributes Judicial Morality to the Gods . . . 567
II. Plato 568
1. He borrows from Judaism 568
2. His Order of Creation agrees with that in Genesis . . 568
3. He adopts both Narratives and burlesques one . . . 569
4. He uses Ideas, or Language, similar to Jewish, concerning Hills 570
5. He uses the Term "Lucifer" 570
6. His "Soul of the World" 571
7. He calls the Deity Father (in the Sense of Originator) . 571
8. His View of Gods in their Judicial Capacity . . . 571

9. His View of a Future Life 572
10. His View of the Origin of Motion 573
11. His View of the Character of Gods 575
12. His Panacea was Force 576
13. Obscurity of his Language 579
III. Heraclitus, Predecessor of the Stoics 580

NOTE L.

Two Narratives in Genesis I.–XI. 581

NOTE M.

Locality of Greek Culture 587

INDEXES.

I. Quotations from Scripture 591
II. Citations from Ancient Authors 593
III. Words and Subjects 598

JUDAISM AT ROME.

CHAPTER I.

ANCIENT JUDAISM.

§ 1. *Its Field for Growth.*

At the present day the Jews exercise no perceptible religious influence on the Christian communities amid which they dwell. Their religion has no advantage over Christianity, either as regards its accordance with reason, its adaptation to human wants, or the evidence on which it rests. Not improbably the absence of modern conversions to it has blinded prominent writers to its influence on the heathens of antiquity.

That the Jews in Eastern countries made numerous converts to the main points of their faith is obvious from the frequent mention of such converts in the New Testament, and from addresses or allusions to them, which imply their existence as a well-recognized class.[1] In the course of this work it will become evident, that in Syria and portions of Asia Minor, and perhaps even to the eastward of these countries, they had, at the Christian era, largely displaced the ancient religions. In North Egypt they were numerous and influential, as will appear from events in the year 37; and their views were, before the Christian era, gaining rapid foothold at Rome. Mul-

[1] See note 34; Note B, footnotes 43, 44; Ch. XIII. note 39; compare Ch. IV.

titudes of Gentiles must, without adopting Judaism, have adopted Monotheism.

Wherever belief in a Moral Ruler of the universe was diffused, civilization received an impetus. Belief in such a Ruler gave encouragement to, and sense of responsibility for, a right use of life. Intellectual and social development became most marked in those Gentile communities where Jewish influence was greatest.

§ II. *Its First Impediment.*

A difficulty experienced by modern missionaries in heathen lands[2] evidently confronted the Jews in their

---

[2] "Of late, I have been busily engaged in collating notes and quotations, on the proper word for expressing the name of the Supreme Being, in Chinese. The weight of authority, i. e. most of the most learned missionaries, have given their influence in favor of using *Shang-te*, but many others dislike the term exceedingly, as being the proper name of the chief Chinese god; and when we use it, the people at once say, 'O yes, that 's our Shang-te.' I have satisfied myself pretty well that *Shin* is the proper word to use." — Memoirs of **W. H. Lowrie**, pp. 366, 367.

"Not long ago a very respectable man came to my house one Sabbath. I . . . asked him if he knew anything of Jesus. He replied, he had heard he was the son of 'Yuh hwang ta te,' the 'Jewelled Great Emperor.' This is the chief god, . . . and he is known indifferently by the name above given, or by that of *Shang-te*. I never use the term now, having uniformly found that the people supposed I meant their own Shang-te." — *Ibid.*, p. 421.

"We [the convention] were stopped by a question, . . . 'What is the proper word for God in Chinese?' Morrison and Milne have adopted the word *Shin*, which, according to the best judgment which I can form, means *God*, or *Divinity* in general. Mr. Medhurst for many years used the same term, and even so late as this present year, 1847, has published a dictionary in which he says, 'The Chinese themselves, for God, and invisible beings in general, use *Shin*.' But some twelve years ago or more, he began to use Shang-te, *Supreme ruler*, for the true God, and *shin* for false god. Mr. Gutzlaff also did the same; and these two being the best and most experienced Chinese scholars, had of course great weight. And most of the missionaries were carried away by their example. For some years past, however, there has been a good deal said on the subject, and a strong disposition manifested to return to the old way. *Shang-te*

first efforts. The Greek and Latin languages contained no term for the One Supreme Being. The word "GOD"

---

is objected to, first, as being the distinctive title of the national deity of China, and hence something like the Jupiter of Rome ; and, second, it is not a generic term, and cannot be used in such passages as 'Chemosh thy God, and Jehovah our God,' 'If Jehovah be God,' etc., 'The unknown God, him declare I unto you,' etc. In fact there are many verses where the point and emphasis rest on the use of the same *generic* word all through, as in John **10**, 35, 36, 1 Cor. **8**, 6, etc. Hence of late many of the missionaries wish to return to the old word. . . . Dr. Medhurst, however, . . . printed a book of nearly three hundred pages, in which he maintains that *shin* never means god, much less the Supreme God. This, by the way, is in opposition to three dictionaries of his own, published in the last ten years. . . . We went on with the revision very well, till we came to Matt. **1**, 23, where the word *Theos* occurs. Dr. Bridgman then proposed that we use the word *Shin*. Bishop Boone seconded this ; and it was well known that my views coincided with theirs. Dr. Medhurst and Mr. Stronach took decided ground for *Shang-te ;* and so we have now been discussing this question for three weeks, Medhurst and Boone being chief speakers. . . . Bishop Boone and myself worked hard for a week, and wrote out an argument for *Shin*, covering twenty-six folio pages. Dr. Medhurst . . . took our answer so seriously, that he said he must have some weeks to prepare a reply. . . . I greatly fear that the result of all will be, that each side will hold their own views, and Dr. Medhurst and Mr. Stronach will secede. In that case there will be two versions or none. A large majority of the missionaries in China, I believe, are for *Shin*. . . . This of itself is a strong proof for *Shin*, for it shows that even the acknowledged Chinese scholarship of Medhurst and Gutzlaff is not able to command assent for *Shang-te*. But I did not mean to write so much on this." — *Ibid.*, pp. 441, 442.

"What word will you use to speak of God ? . . . If you use the name of the highest divinity known to the people, they will think you favor their own system of religion. If you use the abstract term of God, they will ask, 'What God do you mean ?' and perhaps will run over the names of half a dozen of their principal gods, to see if it be not some one of these you intend. You say no ; you mean 'the true God.' Why, they never thought of such a thing as a false god ! They will very willingly allow that your god is a true God, but they expect equal toleration for their own ; and you will find it no easy matter to convince them that when you speak of God, you mean only one."—*Ibid.*, pp. 449, 450. Compare in Ch. XIV. note 2, the difficulties of South African missionaries, as narrated by Moffat.

was a common noun as is our word "MAN." If we say that man is of limited capacity, or liable to err, or mortal, the expression is readily understood as meaning that human nature is limited, or that men are liable to err, or that all men are mortal. The heathen use of the term "god" was analogous. We say "Man proposes, God disposes." By "man" we mean ANY mortal. A Greek or Roman would equally have understood the word "god" as meaning ANY divine being.[3] In order to meet this difficulty, the Jews were forced to connect with the word GOD, or to substitute for it, adjectives which would partially at least convey their meaning.[4]

---

[3] According to Plutarch, "**Antipater of Tarsus**, in his work on the gods, writes verbally as follows: . . . 'We regard then [any] GOD as a being blessed, imperishable and beneficent to men.' Then, carrying out each of these ideas, he says: 'and indeed men generally πάντες regard THEM as imperishable.'"— **Plutarch**, *De Stoic. Repugnant.* 38; *Opp.* **10**, 346. Again, "That evil should take place according to the prior design πρόνοιαν of GOD . . . exceeds every invention of absurdity; for how then shall THEY be givers of good rather than of evil? and how shall evil any longer be [deemed] antagonist to THE GODS?"— **Plutarch**, *Adv. Stoicos*, 14; *Opp.* **10**, 397. Josephus, in a passage which illustrates the use of language, though it errs in ascribing polytheism to Tiberius, says: "Tiberius . . . prayed to his country's GODS, . . . trusting — as more reliable than his own opinion or wish — whatever should be declared by [some] GOD concerning them [his grandchildren]."— **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **18**, 6, 9. See like use of the term by Seneca, quoted in Ch. II. note 3. Compare, on the foregoing subject, Norton, *Genuineness*, **3**, Note D, as also article by Ezra Abbot in the Christian Examiner, **45**, 389 – 406.

[4] The Jewish writers in the **Sibylline Oracles** term the Deity the "Great God," Θεὸς μέγας, **1**, 53; **2**, 27; **3**, 19, 97, 162, 194, 246, 284, 297, 306, 490, 549, 556, 557, 565, 575, 584, 593; **4**, 6, 25, 162; **7**, 24; the "True God," Θεὸς ἀληθινός, Proem, **2**, 46 (other editions 84); the "Highest," ὕψιστος, Proem, **1**, 4; "Sole Ruler," μόναρχος, **3**, 11; the "Unborn," ἀγένητος, Proem, **1**, 7, 17; the "Self-born," αὐτογενής, Proem, **1**, 17; the "Invisible," ἀόρατος, Proem, **1**, 8, Book **3**, 12; "All-ruler," παντοκράτωρ, Proem, **1**, 8; "Imperishable," ἄφθιτος, **5**, 358; "Indestructible," ἄφθαρτος, **2**, 285; the "Creator," κτίστης, Proem, **2**, 17, Book **1**, 45; the "Forefather," γενετήρ, **3**, 278, 296; **5**, 284, 360,

§ III. *The Aristocracy its Chief Enemy.*

After Judaism had become a recognized force in the Roman community, and after party lines had been distinctly drawn,— forcing it into a yet closer connection with the popular party than its teachings alone would imply,— its trials were, as a rule, in periods of aristocratic success, and its palmy periods in times of aristocratic reverses. Exceptions to this occur. But the exceptions may have resulted from laws passed during aristocratic ascendency, or have been caused by aristocratic intrigue.

The Senate, before it was remodelled by Julius Cæsar, and again after B. C. 17, when monotheism and liberal political views were expurgated from it, was the zealous, though not always discreet or consistent advocate of the established religion. The reason for this is obvious. The established religion was exclusively under Senatorial control, and was managed in the Senatorial interest. The popular party, whether from correct views of human rights or as a protest against Senatorial assumption, wished apparently to legalize any religion whose teaching or management was independent of Senatorial records or action.[5] The hold which any one of these religions had on the popular mind is a different question. Judaism was, prior to Christianity, the only religion known at Rome which appealed to moral sense and interested itself with man's moral improvement. This was a feature to which its less intelligent or less honest advocates did not always give due prominence. They were not competent to appreciate it. The Senate, without appreciating it, found in the developed moral sense of the community their chief cause of fear.

406; **8**, 22; the "Ineffable," or else the "Destitute of Oracles," *ἀθέσφατος*, **3**, 11; "Him who is God," *τὸν ἐόντα θεόν*, **3**, 33; "Guardian of all things," *ὃς πάντα φυλάσσει*, **3**, 33; the "Great King," *βασιλεὺς μέγας*, **3**, 499, 560.

Compare Christian phraseology in Ch. XI. in the text prefixed to foot-notes 45–48.

[5] See in Note H, foot-note 2, the legalization of the Egyptian religion in B. C. 58, the year of Cicero's banishment.

How early the struggle began cannot certainly be determined. The Jewish teaching imposed in B. C. 76 upon the Senate implies either that the Senate did not know the nature of what it was obtaining, or that public attention had not previously been called to the dispute with Judaism. The former of these is the more probable supposition. Senatorial merriment in B. C. 63 over a Jewish expectation, and Cicero's complaint in B. C. 59 of Jewish influence on Roman assemblies, imply that party lines were then already drawn.

Not long before the accession to power of the popular party under Julius Cæsar, while the conflict was still fierce and the patricians confident of success, we find Cicero advocating that no one should be permitted the exercise of any religion either publicly or privately, except what had been established by the Senate.[6]

When Cæsar attained to power, we find a procession annually of Roman dignitaries on the first day of the passover, for the purpose of throwing away idol images, and at his funeral Jews were conspicuous.

When the aristocracy again obtained control, in B. C. 30, by the victory over Antony, they were hampered by members of the popular party, some of them doubtless monotheists, whom Julius Cæsar had introduced into the Senate. Some of these were at once, by threats or otherwise, eliminated,[7] and in B. C. 18 or 17, by a preconcerted plot, of which an account will hereafter be given, nearly all the advocates of monotheism and of popular rights were violently ejected.

In A. D. 19 this reactionary Senate, during a fierce con-

---

[6] Cicero's work, *De Legibus*, was commenced, according to Smith's Dictionary, during or after B. C. 52. Not impossibly Cæsar's accession to power rendered its completion inadvisable or useless. In it he takes the ground: "Let no one have gods separately, nor let men in private worship new gods or foreign ones unless [such as have been] publicly introduced. Let them have in cities the shrines constructed by THE FATHERS." **Cicero**, *De Leg.* **2**, 8. The proposition, though borrowed from Plato, represents probably THE INFLUENCES by which Plato and Cicero were surrounded.

[7] **Dio Cass. 52,** 42.

flict against Tiberius and the popular party, undertook to put Cicero's suggestion in practice. They drove the Jews out of Rome, prohibited under severe penalties any adherence to Jewish teaching, and searched houses for its converts.

From this date forward no Gentile, while residing at Rome, could legally profess Judaism. This gave the aristocracy an advantage in all subsequent political struggles. Charges of ἀσέβεια, impiety or Unbelief, became a favorite weapon in their hands. Some uncertainty is created touching the evidence for this by their partially successful effort to represent piety as an obligation, not to the gods, but to the state.[8] Yet there can be no question that Unbelief in the heathen deities, or lack of respect towards them, was a frequent ground of criminal prosecution against members of the popular party. Charges of Unbelief or impiety towards an individual god originated in the year 14, when the Senate deified Augustus.[9] Tiberius promptly remonstrated that the deification of his adoptive father ought not to become a means of destruction to Roman citizens; that offences against the gods should be left to their own cognizance.[10]

---

[8] See Appendix, Note A, § v. 4, and Note B, § II. 2.

[9] "Tiberius disregarded [charges of] disrespect towards any one and Unbelief in regard to any one [deity?], for ALREADY [A. D. 14] such behavior was called Unbelief, and many were brought to trial upon this charge." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 9.

[10] The deification of Augustus by the Senate was an act of political hostility to Tiberius and to the popular party. Tacitus, who constantly misrepresents him as endorsing it, must have slightly altered his phraseology in the following. Tiberius "wrote to the consuls, that heaven had not been [should not have been?] decreed to his father, in order that the honor might be perverted to the destruction of Roman citizens, . . . that injuries to the gods should be left to the care of the gods." — **Tac.** *An.* **1,** 73.

As a sample of these accusations, it was charged against Falanius (**Tac.** *An.* **1,** 73) that when selling his gardens he had included in the sale a statue of Augustus; that among worshippers of Augustus — who according to the hard story of Tacitus, were to be found in all homes like a college [of priests] — he had (*Ibid.*) admitted an actor. Marcellus

In A. D. 19 the "terribly severe accusations of Unbelief" were weapons employed by the patrician against the popular party.[11] Among items of this contest was the fault found with Drusus, son of Tiberius, in A. D. 22, after his entry on the tribuneship: "Were all things fallen so low that even a youth, on accepting such honor, should not approach the GODS OF ROME? . . . Was the ruler of the human race imbued with such ideas; was this his first lesson from his father's teachings?"[12]

We find later, that two persons of the same family name were charged respectively with Unbelief and with adherence to Foreign Superstition.[13] We find that after the aristocratic revolt of A. D. 31, charges of Unbelief were a customary resource of the patrician faction against those in the popular party whose relatives they had murdered.

---

was charged (**Tac.** *An.* **1,** 74) with cutting the head from a statue of Augustus; Rubrius (**Tac.** *An.* **1,** 73), with having "violated the divinity of Augustus by perjury." Tiberius treated the first three charges as not deserving consideration. His remarks on the last, after allowing for alteration of his phraseology by Tacitus, seem to have been that a man who perjured himself "by Jupiter" or "by Augustus" was equally guilty.

The wording of Tacitus might cause, and was probably intended to convey, an inference that Tiberius heartily endorsed the deification of his father.

[11] "Tiberius [that is, the Senate in spite of him and from hostility to him] was terribly severe in accusations of Unbelief, if any one were charged with saying or doing anything unbecoming towards, not only Augustus, but himself (?) and his mother. (?)" — **Dio Cass. 57,** 19. Compare note 9, as also in the Appendix, Note G, foot-notes 3, 48, and 114. Caligula, two years subsequently to the death of Tiberius, after convicting the Senate from its own records of having perpetrated the very murders which it was charging upon Tiberius, seems to have selected especially the charges of ἀσέβεια, Unbelief (see Appendix, Note G, foot-note 114), for the purpose of engraving them on a brazen tablet or pillar. Probably these implied, that when senators wished to destroy an opponent guiltless of wrong-doing, they charged him with Unbelief.

[12] **Tac.** *An.* **3,** 59. We find in **Dio Cass. 57,** 21 and 23, that charges of Unbelief were, in A. D. 22, still a staple article.

[13] Pomponius was charged with ἀσέβεια, Unbelief; (**Dio Cass. 59,** 6); Pomponia, with adherence to Foreign Superstition (**Tac.** *An.* **13,** 32).

Caligula, whose parents had been leaders of that faction; effected, on his accession, a political truce and a brief cessation of these prosecutions.[14] During his illness, however, in the same year, the aristocracy plotted rebellion, and again resorted to these charges as a ready means of parrying indictment for their crimes.

When Claudius succeeded Caligula, the aristocracy, as will be explained under its proper date, needed to strengthen their coadjutor Herod. Therefore accusations for Unbelief were temporarily suspended,[15] as also any re-expulsion of the Jews. The latter was carried out in A. D. 52.

In the beginning of Nero's reign an abortive effort was made towards prosecuting for Foreign Superstition, but nothing apparently was effected in that direction until after the commencement of the Jewish Rebellion. Prior to that date either the influence of Seneca, or of Nero's wife Poppæa, the former a Stoic, the latter a monotheist, or a natural reaction against the violent patricianism of the preceding reign, may have prevented it. After the Jewish Rebellion had commenced, Unbelief became again the subject of prosecution, not only under Nero, but under his three temporary successors. "Vespasian [in A. D. 70] sent to Rome and wiped out the stigma from those, both living and dead, who under Nero and his successors had been condemned upon charges of Unbelief." [16]

In the brief reign of Titus the aristocracy regained much of their political influence, but trials for Unbelief or impiety were not allowed.[17]

---

[14] In A. D. 37 Caligula "stopped the accusations for Unbelief." — **Dio Cass. 59,** 4. Caligula "discharged those who were imprisoned . . . and set aside the charges of Unbelief from which he saw that most of them were suffering." — **Dio Cass. 59,** 6.

[15] Claudius, "not only in his decree [A. D. 41], but practically, put a stop to accusations for Unbelief."— **Dio Cass. 60,** 3. "He discharged those who had fallen [into fetters] because of Unbelief and such charges." — **Dio Cass. 60,** 4.

[16] **Dio Cass. 66,** 9.

[17] **Dio Cass. 66,** 19. An explanatory remark which Dio puts into the mouth of Titus would, if it be not an invention, or if its connection have not been altered, imply that ἀσέβεια in this instance meant disre-

Whether the prosecutions against, and expulsion of, Atheists and Unbelievers, at the close of Domitian's reign, were his doings, or whether the aristocracy carried them out during his absence and from hostility to him, will be discussed under its appropriate date. Nerva, his successor, belonged to the popular party, and during his brief reign Unbelievers in the national deities were recalled.

Under Trajan aristocratic ideas were dominant. Between his government and the Jews a bitter state of feeling existed.

It deserves notice that the party which so zealously proscribed its opponents for Unbelief, confessed, in the time of Claudius, its utter ignorance of how the gods were to be served, and needed to summon learned slaves from Etruria, who were supposed to have knowledge on the subject.

Connected with this question of Unbelief was the position assigned to praise of Homer as a test of orthodoxy. If Caligula expressed contempt for him, we can at once recognize that Caligula was no friend to patricianism.[18] If Claudius frequently and publicly quoted the poet,[19] his patricianism would be a safe inference. If Dio Chrysostom did not believe Homer, he was on that account charged with Unbelief.[20] Plutarch tried to be on both sides of the fence simultaneously,[21] and so perhaps did those who allegorized Homer.[22]

Vespasian's reign was a coalition between himself as head of the popular party, and Mucianus as leader of the moderate conservatives. The Senate was so reconstituted

---

spect to the prince. Compare in the Appendix, Note A, § v. 4, and Note B, § ii. 2.

[18] See Ch. VIII. note 55.

[19] **Sueton.** *Claud.* 42.

[20] See Appendix, Note A, foot-note 63.

[21] See under Ch. X. § iv. the conclusion of sub-section 10.

[22] "In one of the manuscripts [from Herculaneum] which was in the hands of the interpreters when I visited the museum, the author indulges in the speculation that all the Homeric personages were allegorical; that Agamemnon was the ether, Achilles the sun, Helen the earth, Paris the air, Hector the moon, etc." — **Lyell,** *Geology,* Vol. **2,** note on pp. 157, 158. Edit. London, 1835.

by him as to represent, for a time at least, better ideas, and in his reign dissent from heathen theology did not entail imprisonment and loss of life, nor even, if we may judge from the elder Pliny's case, of social standing.[23]

§ IV. *They oppose its Associate, Greek Culture.*

A relationship existed between Judaism and Greek culture, on the nature and cause of which some remarks will hereafter be offered.[24] Any sketch of hostility by patricians to the former would be imperfect without mention of their hostility to the latter.

It is plain, that, from an early date, Greek culture, accompanied not improbably by monotheistic ideas of human rights, was an object of special jealousy to patricians.[25] On the contrary, in the days of Julius Cæsar,

---

[23] "I think it a human imbecility to inquire for the appearance and form of [a] god."— **Pliny,** *Nat. Hist.* **2**, 5, 1. "The belief of marriages among the gods, and that in such an age no one has been born therefrom; that some gods are superannuated and forever hoary, others youths and boys, [some] black, winged, lame, born from an egg, also living and dying on alternate days, is the puerility of persons almost insane. But it is the excess of impudence to fabricate the existence among them of adulteries and thereto of quarrels and hatreds, and even that there are tutelar divinities of thieves and criminals. It is god [like ?] *deus est* for a mortal to assist a mortal, and this is the way to eternal glory. By this path the Roman leaders trod. By it Vespasian, the greatest ruler of any age, now treads with celestial step, in company with his children." — **Pliny,** *Nat. Hist.* **2**, 5, 3, 4. Pliny was a Pantheist. His views of what befitted a divine nature accord with monotheistic ones, and contradict what had been upheld by the aristocracy. He leaned to the popular side, for he wrote a life of Pomponius, and, as above seen, praised Vespasian.

[24] See Ch. XIII. § IV. and close of § I.

[25] According to **Suetonius** (*De Illust. Gram.* 2), the earliest teacher of grammar at Rome was Crates. He was a Stoic, born at Mallus in Cilicia, educated at Tarsus, and, for a time, chief librarian at Pergamus. He came to Rome about B. C. 157, as ambassador of King Attalus.

"Rhetoric also, in like manner as grammar, found a late reception among us [Romans] and also a somewhat more difficult one, since the fact is well established, that it was cultivated sometimes under prohibition. . . . *In the consulship of Caius Fannius Strabo and M. Valerius*

when popular ideas had ascendency, Greek culture found a welcome. He gave to physicians and teachers the right of Roman citizenship,[26] so that when, in after years, foreigners, or, according to Pliny, Greeks specially, were expelled, an exception had to be made in favor of these two classes.[27] At a later date, after the reactionary

Messala [B. C. 161] . . . they [the Senate] decreed that 'M. Pomponius the prætor shall take such measures, and make such provisions, as the good of the Republic and the duty of his office require, that NO PHILOSOPHERS OR RHETORICIANS BE SUFFERED AT ROME.'

"After some interval, the censors, Cnæus Domitius Ænobarbus and Lucius Licinius Crassus [B. C. 92], issued the following edict upon the same subject: 'IT IS REPORTED to us that certain persons have instituted a new kind of discipline; that our youth resort to their schools; that they [to evade the law] have assumed the title of LATIN Rhetoricians; and that young men waste their time there for whole days together. Our ancestors have ordained what instruction it is fitting their children should receive, and what schools they should attend. These novelties, contrary to the usages and customs of our ancestors, we neither approve, nor do they appear to us good. Wherefore it appears to be our duty that we should notify our judgment both to those who keep such schools and to those who are in the practice of frequenting them, that they meet our disapprobation.'

"But the same mode of teaching was not adopted by all. . . . Nor did they omit, on occasion, to resort to translations from the Greek, and to expatiate in the praise, or to launch their censures on the faults, of illustrious men. They also dealt with MATTERS CONNECTED WITH EVERY-DAY LIFE, pointing out such as are useful and necessary, and such as are hurtful and needless."—**Sueton.** *De Clar. Rhetor.* 1, Bohn's trans. altered.

Cato the censor, in his old age, not improbably between B. C. 160 and B. C. 150, wrote as follows to his son: "I will speak in its proper place concerning those Greeks. . . . Whenever that race shall impart [to us] its literature, it will corrupt all things, and yet more if it shall send its physicians hither."—Cato *quoted in* **Pliny,** *Nat. Hist.* **29,** 7, 1. "He [Cato the censor] always maintained, moreover, that ALL GREEKS SHOULD BE EXPELLED FROM ITALY." — **Pliny,** *Nat. Hist.* **7,** 31, 4.

[26] **Sueton.** *Cæs.* 43.

[27] "The ancients . . . are said . . . when they EXPELLED GREEKS FROM ITALY, long after Cato's time, to have excepted physicians."—**Pliny,** *Nat. Hist.* **29,** 8, 1, 2. This took place under Augustus. "On one occasion, in a season of great scarcity, . . . he [Augustus] ordered out

reign of Claudius, we find even medical science decried by the aristocracy, as can safely be inferred from the language of Pliny in defending it.[28]

In determining the relations between patricianism and Greek culture, the sequence of events claims attention. Before the popular party gained ascendency, we find such culture decried or prohibited. During the ascendency of that party it was honored. Subsequently, when Augustus, under patrician influence, attacked and overthrew Antony, we find that Dio Cassius puts into the mouth of Agrippa, THE LEADER OF PATRICIANISM, an argument for, and into the mouth of Mæcenas, THE PATRON OF GREEK CULTURE, an argument against the abdication by Augustus of his authority,[29] which would, at that date, have meant the restoration of unlimited power to the Senate. When patricianism gained yet more control, and drove its opponents from the Senate, Mæcenas fell into disfavor.[30]

---

of the city . . . all foreigners, excepting physicians and the teachers of the liberal sciences. Part of the domestic slaves were also ordered to be dismissed." — **Sueton.** *August.* 42, Bohn's trans. The pretext for expulsion was a dearth, the result of accident or design. The real motive was, doubtless, a political one. **Dio Cassius** (**55**, 26) mentions a banishment of gladiators and slaves in A. D. 6, because of dearth. The expulsion of Greeks may have taken place then, or earlier.

[28] **Pliny, 29,** 8, 5.

[29] The argument of Agrippa is in **Dio Cass. 52,** 2 – 13 ; that of Mæcenas follows it in §§ 14 – 40. The conclusion of the former and beginning of the latter are lost. We can safely infer that Agrippa and Mæcenas held opposing views, or they would not have been selected as opposing speakers. The arguments attributed to them cannot be trusted as representing their respective views on points introduced. These arguments are the work of some dexterous senatorial politician. He makes Agrippa — the leader and embodiment of the oligarchy — assume popular government as the alternative to monarchical rule, and makes Mæcenas suggest an expurgation of the Senate, effected by his enemies at a date which ended his political career.

[30] "Between B. C. 21 and 16, . . . we have direct evidence that a coolness, to say the least, had sprung up between the emperor and his faithful minister. . . . The political career of Mæcenas may be considered as then at an end." — **Smith,** *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* **2,** 892, 893. It will be remembered that the patrician plot whereby nearly all

Yet later, under Augustus, we find, during this patrician rule, an ejection of the Greek population. The exclusion of Latin Stoics from public affairs[31] was due, doubtless, to their affinity with those exponents of Greek culture who had borrowed most from Judaism.

The scantiness of any literature save Greek must have made it, or translations from it, the main resource for filling libraries. It accords, therefore, with what we have just seen, that Julius Cæsar, the popular leader, should have been the first to plan a public library at Rome, and when death prevented him from accomplishing it, that Pollio, one of his generals, prominent on the popular — and perhaps also on the monotheistic — side, should have been the earliest to establish one.[32] Whether the two libraries afterwards started by Augustus were freely open to the popular party and TO ITS LITERATURE may (see Ch. V. note 58) be doubted.

After A. D. 19, when monotheism at Rome became illegal, the more conscientious and self-respecting Greeks may, especially in aristocratic reigns, have been chary of residing there. Such as were willing vehemently to advocate heathen customs and heathen deities might still be welcomed by patricians. The Greek population of the city not improbably deteriorated after the above-mentioned date.

§ V. *Close of Jewish Influence in Europe.*

A benevolent law of Domitian or Nerva had, in Hadrian's time, been misapplied, in some regions at least, as

members of the popular party were eliminated from the Senate took place in B. C. 18 or B. C. 17, under the lead of Agrippa. Mæcenas is said (**Dio Cass. 55,** 7 ; **Seneca,** *Epist.* **114,** 8) to have advocated humane measures as well as Greek literature. That **Tacitus** (*An.* **14,** 53), by terming the leisure of Mæcenas *velut peregrinum*, meant to stigmatize it as anti-Roman and unpatriotic, is more than probable.

[31] "I call your attention to those Stoics, who, excluded *republica* from public affairs, have retired to a cultivation of [private] life and to the establishment of laws for the human race." — **Seneca,** *Epist.* **14,** 13 ; *Opp. Philos.* **2,** 130.

[32] **Smith,** *Dict. of Antiq.* 202, col. 2, art. *Bibliotheca.*

a prohibition to the Jews of their national rite. This caused, about A. D. 130, a wide-spread and embittered war of several years' duration. The war stamped itself in unmistakable characters on the mental and social history of the second century as one of the noteworthy contests in the world's history; yet historians have scarcely mentioned or alluded to this remarkable struggle. After its termination the influence of Jews in Europe was at an end. Thenceforward they were an ISOLATED people, unappreciated, and too often calumniated or maltreated, whilst, no doubt, they suffered in character and culture from the position in which they were placed.

In Asia the remnants of Jewish influence must have been strong, for both Mohammedanism and Eastern Christianity bear imprints of it.[33] In Africa also it must have attracted attention in the third century if not later.[34]

---

[33] Mohammedans have not only adopted many Jewish opinions, but at least one Jewish custom, that of abstinence from pork. The Oriental Church, according to **Routh** (*Reliq. Sacræ*, **1**, 343, note), imitates Jews in forbidding the eating of blood.

[34] **Tertullian** mentions (*Adv. Judæos*, 1; *Opp.* p. 205, A) a dispute between a convert to Judaism and a Christian as having attracted a crowd, part of whom sided with each. Compare his remarks cited in Ch. IV. note 11, concerning heathen suspension of work on the Sabbath. Commodianus also cannot have written earlier than the third century. He was not an Asiatic, for he wrote in Latin. His style renders probable that he lived in Africa. In his *Instructions* he addresses heathens of doubtful mind in the following manner:

> "Why in the synagogue do you run to the Pharisees
> That [God] may be made merciful to you, whom outside you deny?
> You go outside, you again seek [heathen] temples.
> You wish, between each, to LIVE, but will thereby perish."
> **Commodianus**, *Instruct.* **24**, 11-14.
>
> What! do you wish to be half Jew, half heathen?
> . . . . .
> But you go to those from whom you can learn nothing;
> You leave their doors and go thence to idols.
> Ask what is the FIRST precept in the Law.
> . . . .
> Of God's precepts they narrate to you only the marvellous."
> **Commodianus**, *Instruct.* **37**, 1-13.

During the whole period when Jews exercised an influence at Rome, even when most favored, there is no evidence that they sought or held office. Of this the probable explanation is, that official position would have brought them into such contact with idolatry as was repugnant to their religious views. The same repugnance induced many Christians to avoid and condemn office-holding. The political importance of the Jews inside of Italy must have been owing almost solely to their influence on the popular mind, — a remark which is less true of their position in Asia. There it is evident that they sometimes held office, for in Cæsarea, where the majority of the population were heathen, the city government was, during a part of Nero's reign, in the hands of the Jews. It was transferred to the heathens just before the war broke out.[35]

CHAPTER II.

CAUSES OF JEWISH INFLUENCE.

§ 1. *Chief Causes.*

THE causes of Jewish influence upon heathens admit of division into two classes. The main ones will be presented in this section, leaving the secondary and perhaps doubtful ones for subsequent consideration.

Jewish views of God and of religious duties, especially as advocated by the thoughtfully liberal, commended themselves infinitely more to common sense and moral sense than did those of heathens. These views of God encouraged right effort and strengthened conscience, so that the character of Jews and their converts was elevated to a higher average than that of heathens. The points of difference between the two systems and their followers claim attention *seriatim.*

---

[35] See Appendix, Note I. foot-note 3.

1. Judaism alone, among religions on earth prior to Christianity, taught the existence of A DIVINE BEING WHO TOOK INTEREST IN THE MORAL EDUCATION OF MANKIND. This Being was represented as supreme in power, wisdom, and goodness; as having, because of his interest in man, made a revelation,[1] which was addressed to his moral sense.[2]

---

[1] Very ignorant and debased tribes or nations may have no thought on the object of man's existence, nor any desire beyond the supply of daily gratifications; but in the Roman Empire, when Judaism was spreading, there must in all classes have been thoughtful and cultivated persons with deeper wants. Such persons would thankfully receive and examine the claims of Judaism. To use the language of another: "It is not true, . . . that intellectual weakness most stands in need of religion, or is most fitted to feel the need of it; but it is intellectual strength. I hold no truth to be more certain than this, that every mind, in proportion to its real development and expansion, is dark, is disproportioned, and unhappy, without religion. If in this life alone it has hope, it is of all minds the most miserable."— **Dewey**, *Works*, **1**, 278. "Humanity, in fine, and especially in its growing cultivation, is too hard a lot, it appears to me, if God has not opened for it the fountains of revelation." — **Dewey**, *Works*, **3**, 256.

In this connection a fact calls for earnest consideration; namely, that no COMMUNITY, destitute of a belief in revelation, has ever believed in a Moral Ruler of the universe.

[2] If the ceremonial law — concerning which some remarks occur in the next section — be regarded as an original part of Judaism, a part of the revelation made to Moses, then that revelation, though addressed to the moral sense, was not EXCLUSIVELY so addressed. Accordingly, as we come to one or a different conclusion on this subject, the following remarks concerning Christianity will appear partially or fully applicable to Judaism: "I ask you to consider on what principle of human nature the Christian revelation is intended to bear. . . . It was plainly not given to enrich the intellect by teaching philosophy, or to perfect the imagination and taste by furnishing sublime and beautiful models of composition. It was not meant to give sagacity in public life, or skill and invention in common affairs. It was undoubtedly designed to develop all these faculties, but secondarily, and through its influence on a higher principle. It addresses itself primarily, and is especially adapted, to the moral power in man. . . . Is there a foundation in the moral principle for peculiar interpositions in its behalf? I affirm that there is.

Heathenism had a multitude of discordant deities, NOT ONE OF WHOM WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE SHOWN INTEREST IN MAN'S MORAL IMPROVEMENT OR MORAL ENCOURAGEMENT. Their alleged communications to men, however frequent, were never upon moral topics,[3] nor were questions in morality, so far as records exist, ever addressed to their oracles.[4] Their own characters as depicted, not merely

---

I affirm that a broad distinction exists between our moral nature and our other capacities. Conscience is the supreme power within us. . . . All our other powers become useless and worse than useless, unless controlled by the principle of duty."—**Channing,** *Works,* **3,** 335, 336.

[3] Omens were deemed *lucky* or *unlucky.* They betokened divine favor or disfavor, success or its opposite, to a journey or voyage ; to a military expedition or battle ; to a purchase or a marriage or to a public meeting. If resort were ever had to them as a means of determining uprightness towards our fellows, I have been unable to find an instance of it. Compare notes 13 and 14.

Cicero makes Cotta, the Roman high-priest, say: "All mortals hold that they receive from the gods EXTERNAL advantages, vineyards, grain-fields, olive groves, productiveness of grain and fruit; in fine, every advantage and convenience of life. But NO ONE EVER attributed [human] virtue to a divine power, as if it had been received." *De Nat. Deorum.* **3,** 36. The connection fairly implies not only that the gods do not confer virtue, but that they do not aid us in its attainment. Compare Plutarch, close of second citation in Ch. X. note 82, and see Ch. VIII. note 126.

Seneca says : "What I have found in Athenodorus is true, '*Know that you will then be free from all* [*improper*] *desires when you shall have reached that point that you shall ask nothing of* [*any*] *god except what you can ask openly.*' For now how great is the madness of mortals ! They whisper most disgraceful vows to THE GODS. If any one approaches to listen they become silent, and what they are unwilling that [a] man should know they narrate to [a] god."—*Epist.* **10,** 4, 5. Compare in Ch. X. note 53, what Lamprias puts into the mouth of Didymus.

[4] Compare on this subject foot-note 53 of Ch. X. **Plato,** whether or not influenced by the teachings of Judaism, rejected the prevalent ideas of divine immorality and injustice. From him, if from any one, we might expect an appeal to oracles on topics of morality. Yet in his model republic the questions to be laid before the chief of oracles are merely ritual. "To the Delphian Apollo, however, there remains the GREATEST, NOBLEST, AND MOST IMPORTANT (!) of legal institutions, . . .

by tradition and popular belief,[5] but by some intelligent men, would have rendered them unfit associates in a decent family.[6] They were thought willing to favor vice and crime when sufficiently paid for it, and wrong-doers

---

the erection of temples, sacrifices and other services to the gods, demons, and heroes; likewise the rites of the dead and what other ceremonies should be gone through, with a view to their propitiation. . . . Nor would we employ any other interpreter than that of the country, . . . this god being the natural interpreter to all men about such matters."— **Plato,** *Republic,* **4,** 5, Bohn's trans. **2,** 111. (Ast, **4,** 208.)

[5] In judging what views of the gods were most prevalent, the statements of tradition and of the poets are important, because they were the chief source of popular instruction touching the divine character. These were unworthy, or vile. **Plato** (*Republic,* **2,** 17, in Bohn **2,** 59, and Ast **4,** 112) proposes that in his model republic no one shall be allowed to narrate them either in allegory or otherwise, and that poets shall be "COMPELLED," ἀναγκαστέον, to teach otherwise.

Again, in hymns to the gods, we should expect less levity than in other poetic compositions. Yet these, as any one by reading them can find, are destitute of moral conceptions, and often positively vicious. In Bohn's translation of Homer, *The Odyssey,* etc., pp. 349–426, more than thirty such hymns will be found. The writings of Horace (*Odes,* **1,** 10, 21, 30, 31, 35; **2,** 10; **3,** 3, 11, 18, 22, 25, 26; **4,** 1, 2, 6) furnish other specimens. The Hymn of Cleanthes, belonging to a different literature, will be mentioned in the next chapter.

[6] "There is a treatise of Servius Sulpitius, a prominent man [entitled] *Quamobrem mensa linquenda non sit,* 'WHAT EVENTS FORBID LEAVING THE TABLE.' . . . They who believe the gods to be present in all our concerns at every hour have instituted these rules, and have accordingly handed down [to us] that the gods were to be pacified even by our vices."— **Pliny,** *Nat. Hist.* **28,** 5, 4, 5. Compare touching Pliny's position, Ch. I. note 23.

Tacitus, alluding, as it would seem, to the earthquakes in Campania, the eruption of Vesuvius, and the civil broils and conflagrations of Rome, remarks: "Never has it been made manifest by more fearful destructions of the Roman people, nor by more reliable proofs, that the gods do not care for our security but for [their own] revenge."— **Tacitus,** *Hist.* **1,** 3. Elsewhere, the same writer, after narrating, with no expression of mistrust, a silly fabrication concerning Tiberius and an astrologer, proceeds: "But when I hear such and similar things, my judgment is in doubt whether mortal affairs are determined by fate and immutable

sought their co-operation in misdeeds. If a man of thought and culture discarded tradition, there remained no ground on which to believe the existence of any specified deity in the catalogue.[7] If he observed evidence of design in the universe or its management, this agreed with Jewish teaching, — with the idea of ONE God rather than with the heathen conception of many, with the belief in a Creator, rather than in gods born since the world existed.

Weak-minded persons might dread the heathen deities, and conservative politicians might be eloquent or grandiloquent over the "NATIONAL" gods, but respect for such beings was out of the question.

2. If we now consider RELIGIOUS DUTIES, we shall find between heathens and Jews a difference equally marked. The weekly services at the Jewish synagogue included teachings concerning God and HUMAN DUTY.[8]

---

necessity, or by chance. Since [on this point] you will find the wisest ancients, as well as their imitators [that is, the UNQUESTIONABLY ORTHODOX according to aristocratic conservatism], differing from each other; many of them holding 'that the gods care nothing for our beginning, our end, nor, in fine, FOR MEN; that, therefore, very frequently misfortune attends the good and prosperity the worse.' Others think, on the contrary, (?) that things are in accordance with fate. . . . The majority of mortals have not given up the opinion that at each one's birth his futurity is determined."— **Tacitus,** *Annals,* **6,** 22. In the foregoing an immutable fate seems to be regarded as the opposite of divine indifference towards mortals. Compare in Ch. X. IV. 10, quotation by Plutarch from the Iliad, **24,** lines 525, 526, and also his first quotation from Euripides.

[7] After the above was written, I noticed the following: "As respects their existence and care for us, we neither know nor have heard of them otherwise than from traditions and from the poets who write their genealogies; and these very persons tell us that they are to be moved and persuaded by sacrifices and propitiatory vows and offerings; — both of which [namely, their existence and alleged character] we are to believe, or neither." — **Plato,** *Republic,* **2,** 8, Bohn's trans. These remarks are put by Plato into the mouth of an objector.

[8] The earliest Christian assemblies copied from the synagogue their method of conducting religious meetings. In fact the more Jewish Christians must frequently have worshipped with the non-Christian

These services must have been imperfect, for they were conducted by human beings, yet the heathen who entered when a thoughtful Jew was reading, might listen to views which the range of heathen literature nowhere presented, — to the idea that GOD WAS TO BE SERVED by justice and kindness towards our fellows, and by maintaining a right frame of mind;[9] that this was the service

---

Jews in the same place of gathering. Any decided difference in the method of conducting such meetings would have occasioned disagreements, and left obvious traces.

[9] "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before thy God?" — **Micah, 6,** 8. Compare Deut. **10,** 12.

"And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of the vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger: I am the Lord your God.

"Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another. And ye shall not swear by my name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I am the Lord.

"Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor, neither rob him: the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning. Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumbling-block before the blind, but shalt fear thy God: I am the Lord.

"Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not [in giving judgment] respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty, but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor. Thou shalt not go up or down as a tale-bearer among thy people; neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbor: I am the Lord.

"Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; [yet] thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him. Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am the Lord. — **Leviticus, 19,** 9–18.

"Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man, and fear thy God: I am the Lord.

"And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But THE STRANGER THAT DWELLETH WITH YOU SHALL BE UNTO YOU AS ONE BORN AMONG YOU, AND THOU SHALT LOVE HIM AS THYSELF; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God.

"Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight,

which he most desired. If the heathen listened to a judiciously selected psalm or hymn, he heard what might strengthen moral purpose, quicken right affections, or aid

---

or in measures. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin shall ye have; I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them; I am the Lord." — **Leviticus, 19,** 32–37.

"The Lord your God . . . regardeth not persons nor taketh reward. He executes judgment for the fatherless and widow and LOVETH THE STRANGER. . . . LOVE YE THEREFORE THE STRANGER." — **Deut. 10,** 17–19.

"Hear ye the word of Jehovah, ye princes of Sodom!
Give ear to the instruction of our God, ye people of Gomorrah!
What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith Jehovah;
I am satiated with burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts,
In the blood of bullocks and of lambs and of goats I have no delight.
. . . . . .
Put away your evil doings from before mine eyes;
Cease to do evil;
Learn to do well;
Seek justice; relieve the oppressed;
Defend the fatherless; plead for the widow."

Isaiah, 1, 10–18, *Noyes's Translation.*

"Hear, O my people, and I will speak!
. . . .
I will take no bullock from thy house,
Nor he-goat from thy folds;
. . . .
Do I eat the flesh of bulls,
Or drink the blood of goats?
Offer to God thanksgiving,
And pay thy vows to the Most High!
. . . .
"And to the wicked God saith,
To what purpose dost thou talk of my statutes?
And why hast thou my laws upon thy lips?
Thou, who hatest instruction
And castest my words behind thee!"

Ps. 50, 7–17, *Noyes's Translation.*

"How long will ye judge unjustly,
And favor the cause of the wicked?
Defend the poor and the fatherless;
Do justice to the wretched and the needy!
Deliver the poor and the destitute;
Save them from the hand of the wicked!"

Ps. 82, 2–4, *Noyes's Translation.*

devout aspirations.[10] Heathen literature contained nothing which resembled it.

---

[10] "The Lord is merciful and kind,
Slow to anger and rich in mercy."
Ps. 103, 8, *Noyes's Translation.*

"Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help;
. . . . .
Who keepeth truth forever;
Who executeth judgment for the oppressed;
Who giveth food to the hungry.
The Lord setteth free the prisoners;
The Lord openeth the eyes of the blind;
The Lord raiseth up them that are bowed down;
The Lord loveth the righteous;
The Lord PRESERVETH THE STRANGERS;
He relieveth the fatherless and the widow;
But the way of the wicked he maketh crooked."
Ps. 146, 5-9, *Noyes's Translation.*

"The earth is the Lord's, and all that is therein;
The world, and they who inhabit it.
For he hath founded it upon the seas,
And established it upon the floods.
Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord?
And who shall stand in his holy place?
He that hath clean hands and a pure heart;
Who hath not inclined his soul to falsehood,
Nor sworn deceitfully.
He shall receive a blessing from the Lord,
And favor from the God of his salvation."
Ps. 24, 1-5, *Noyes's Translation.*

"Sing unto the Lord, O ye his servants!
And praise his holy name!
For his anger endureth but a moment,
But his favor through life;
In the evening sorrow may be a guest,
But joy cometh in the morning."
Ps. 30, 4, 5, *Noyes's Translation.*

"Teach me, O Lord! the way of thy statutes,
That I may keep it to the end!
Give me understanding, that I may keep thy law;
That I may observe it with my whole heart!"
Ps. 119, 33, 34, *Noyes's Translation.*

"May we fall into the Lord's hands
And not into the hands of men.
For in like measure with his greatness
So also is his compassion."
Sirach, 2, 18.

Of course, a Jew who deemed ceremonial observances ESSENTIAL might present such views of religion as would repel nearly all heathens. He and the class to whom he belonged would make few converts or none, whilst those who taught monotheism and morality as the only essentials [11] would make many. This might and probably did lead to separate religious assemblies,[12] the heathens being thus brought into contact with the more liberal Jews. If a heathen were intelligent enough to study Jewish literature, he could hardly fail to perceive that ALMOST every book which it contained treated more or less of moral duties. He might be perplexed by the stress sometimes laid on ceremonial observances; yet if these were regarded by his teachers as inapplicable to Gentiles, as specially enjoined upon Jews for reasons already buried

---

[11] In the **Sibylline Oracles** (**2**, 50, 51, quoted in the Appendix, Note A, § VIII.) God's rewards are promised,

> "even to Gentile foreigners
> Who live righteously and know one God."

A non-Christian Jew is quoted in one of the gospels as saying, "We know, that . . . if any one be a Monotheist and do his will, such a one God listens to." — **John, 9**, 31. The commendation of Cornelius, uttered to a Christian Jew (**Acts, 10**, 22), is, that "he is a just (or right-dealing) man, and a Fearer-of-God." — **Peter**, though needing a miracle to give him confidence, endorses the view of the non-ritualists: "In every ἔθνει Gentile community the Fearer-of-God, who does rightly, is accepted by him." — **Acts, 10**, 35. "Hear this sole conclusion of reason, 'Fear God and keep his commandments,' since every man should do this." — **Ecc. 12**, 13. See also Micah, **6**, 8, quoted in note 9. On the meaning of the words translated "Monotheist" and "Fearer-of-God" see Appendix, Note B, § I. Nos. 2 and 11. The non-ritualists probably defended their position as did some of the early Christians, by alleging that Enoch, Noah, and others had pleased God without observing the ritual law, which could not therefore be necessary unless for descendants of Abraham. Compare on this subject *Underworld Mission*, pp. 8, 12.

[12] Synagogues are mentioned (**Acts, 6**, 9) of Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and Asians — that is, denizens of the small province called Asia — as existing at Jerusalem. Difference of language may have contributed towards this, but difference of views and habits was probably its chief cause.

in a remote antiquity, they would present less difficulty to him.

If the same man examined what Heathenism taught for religious duties, he found nothing but rites, ceremonies, and augury. Instruction, whether mental or moral, in connection with religious services, was unknown.[13] Much of what passed among heathens for practical religion — namely, augury or divination — he would find to be merely fortune-telling under another name,[14] while other rites and ceremonies were mainly directed towards appeasing a not very good-tempered race of beings,[15] but were utterly disconnected from thoughts of right behavior between man and man. Even if he examined the one or two exceptional heathen writers, who attributed to the gods a better character than the popular one, yet he would find RELIGIOUS DUTIES treated as having no connection with morality[16] or with human improvement.

---

[13] "We do not hear, either in Greece or at Rome, of any class of priests on whom it was incumbent to instruct the people respecting the nature and principles of religion. Of preaching there is not the slightest trace. Religion with the ancients was a thing which was handed down by tradition, . . . and consisted in the proper performance of certain rites and ceremonies. It was respecting these external forms alone that the pontiffs were obliged to give instructions to those who consulted them."— **Smith**, *Dict. of Antiq.* 997, 998, art. *Sacerdos.* Compare note 3.

[14] **Xenophon** represents Socrates as calling the attention of an auditor to this benevolent communicativeness of the deities. "If we are unable to foreknow touching future events what [course of action] will be advantageous, they [the gods] assist us in this [by] telling to inquirers, through divination, how things will turn out, and [by] teaching how they will eventuate most favorably."— Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, **4**, 3, 12. Compare argument of Quintus Cicero in Ch. III. note 67.

[15] In Ch. VIII. § IV. will be quoted from Tacitus, *Annals*, **11**, 15, action by the Senate, and a communication from the Emperor, both of which imply prevalent opinion, that rites were for the pacification of dissatisfied deities. See also the comments by Tacitus (*Hist.* **5**, 13, quoted hereafter in Ch. X. note 96) on Jewish obduracy in not attending to this view of religion, and compare it with his views of the gods already given in note 6 of the present chapter.

[16] Views of Xenophon and Plato concerning the gods will be found in

3. In proportion to human development is the desire for a FUTURE EXISTENCE, the fitting sequel of our present

---

the Appendix, Note K, § I. 4, and § II. 11. **Xenophon** in his *Memorabilia*, **4**, 6, 2–4, makes Socrates explain that *piety*, or practical recognition of the gods, εὐσέβεια, consists in giving the gods due honor, that is, as he is made to say, in giving them what the laws decree to them, and in the manner prescribed by the laws; and although JUSTICE, wisdom, GOODNESS, beauty, courage, monarchy, tyranny, aristocracy, democracy, and plutocracy are treated in the same chapter, and TEMPERANCE in the preceding one, yet none of them are connected with or treated as RELIGIOUS DUTIES. Elsewhere Xenophon puts into the mouth of Socrates the following statement: "You see that the god at Delphi, when any one asks him how he may do a pleasure to the gods, answers, 'Conformably to the law of [your] city.' But the law, everywhere doubtless, is, that the gods ARE TO BE PLEASED BY MEANS OF SACRIFICES in proportion to [each one's] property. HOW THEN CAN ANY ONE honor the gods in a more beautiful and pious way than by doing as they themselves command?" — *Memorabilia*, **4**, 3, 16. Elsewhere, again, Xenophon states (*Memorabilia*, **1**, 3, 1) that Socrates "regarded as superserviceable and vain those who did otherwise," that is, who devoted to the gods more than what the law required. Language of this kind is incompatible with the belief, that a right life was deemed the best method of pleasing the gods. **Plato**, in his *Laws*, gives his ideal of religious services. "It is for us to regulate and lay down by law, in conjunction with the Delphic oracles, festivals, [and] what [are to be] the sacrifices and the divinities, to whom it will be better and more advisable for the state to sacrifice, and at what time and how many in number. . . . For the law will say that there are twelve festivals to the twelve gods, from whom each tribe has its name, and that persons are to make, to each of these, monthly sacrifices, and dances, and musical contests, and to assign the gymnastic exercises, in a manner befitting both to the gods themselves and the several seasons; and to distribute the female festivals likewise, such as ought to be separated from the men, and such as ought not." — *Laws*, **8**, 1, Bohn's trans. **5**, 312, 313. (Ast's edit. **7**, 99, 100). Again, "Let this law be established, that θεῶν . . . ἱερά altars to, or statues of the gods must not be owned in private dwellings. If any one owns separate ones from the public, and has private rites apart from the public, . . . let whoever becomes cognizant thereof announce it to the guardians of the laws, and let them command him to remove his sacred objects to the [locality used by the] public. If they cannot persuade, let them PUNISH HIM until [the ob-

one.[17] If the universe have a Moral Ruler, the conclusion would seem almost inevitable that such a life is in store for us. If no such Ruler exist, the hope of such a life is vain. The propagandists of Judaism in the Roman Empire believed in a future existence. Thoughtful Gentiles, if unhindered by prejudice, would be predisposed towards a faith which gave them hope.

4. To infer that the AVERAGE CHARACTER of Jews surpassed that of heathens is merely to assume that the laws of human nature were not, in their case, suspended. Those who can look up to, commune with, and derive encouragement from superior benevolence and moral worth, whether human or divine, must, as a rule, rise above those who have no such privilege.[18] The presence

---

jects] shall be removed." — *Laws*, **10**, 15 (Ast's edit. **7**, 298; Bohn's trans. **5**, 454). It is insupposable that Plato deemed RELIGIOUS SERVICES an aid to moral sense. Compare note 4.

[17] A future state, unadapted to human improvement or happiness, would lack attraction, and might be repulsive. The Buddhist view of wearisome transmigrations into the bodies of animals and reptiles is not merely destitute of evidence, but, if testimony can be credited, has engendered a desire for annihilation.

[18] In the third century before the Christian era, if not earlier, **Jesus, the son of Sirach**, wrote or compiled a work which, at a later date, his grandson of the same name translated into Greek. This book, sometimes called *Wisdom*, sometimes *Ecclesiasticus*, contains passages which, when compared with anything then extant in heathenism, can only be attributed to the silent influence of monotheism. "Forgive your neighbor his wrong-doing, and then at your request shall your own sins be released. Does a mortal cherish anger against a mortal and yet seek healing from the Lord? Has he no compassion on a mortal like himself? and does he petition touching his own sins?" — **Sirach, 28**, 2–4. "Lend to your neighbor in the time of his need, and [if you have borrowed] repay your neighbor punctually. . . . Many treat a loan as something which they have found. . . . Many because of [such] wickedness refuse [to lend], . . . but be forbearing towards one in humble circumstances, . . . [risk to] lose silver for a brother and friend, . . . you are placing your treasure according to commands of the Most High, and it shall profit you more than the [stipulated] gold-piece." — **Sirach, 29**, 2–11.

or absence, moreover, of rigidly enforced accountability, makes, in the camps and workshops, in the public departments and corporate institutions of a country, the difference between order and disorder, whether of a moral or business kind. The sense of accountability to an all-seeing eye, felt by sincere Jews, for wrong done, or good left undone, must have strengthened their consciences, while the total, or almost total, absence among heathens of any such sense must have produced its natural results upon their characters. Further, a man will devote more attention to an earthly home which he owns than to one which he occupies but for a year. He will strive harder for a personal growth, if permanent, than if it pass away with this life.

History justifies the foregoing conclusions. The Jews were indeed absent from political offices or occupations, and therefore scantily mentioned in political history. The Roman aristocracy, moreover, largely in control of Italian literary marts, were unlikely to perpetuate favorable mention of religionists whom they detested. Yet despite these difficulties reliable evidence has been left us.

The literature which finds circulation in a community is no slight test of its character. Jewish writings treat moral laws, as if their binding character required no argument.[19] This is not the tone — certainly not the prevailing one — of heathens, unless of such as had been influenced by monotheism.[20]

---

[19] See quoted in the Appendix, Note A, § VIII., lines from two Jewish documents which have been intermingled. Moral positions are there affirmed, not argued. Writers on moral topics in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha share largely in this peculiarity.

[20] A writer such as Dio Chrysostom, hereafter to be mentioned (Ch. X. § IV.), was formed more by monotheistic than by heathen influences. **Isocrates**, B. C. 436 – 338 (who, however, had lived in Chios, and was likely therefore to have come in contact with monotheism), is a favorable specimen of a heathen moralist. In the *Ad Demonicum*, his arguments are seldom longer than a sentence. Yet they appeal to various sentiments rather than to moral sense, and among the positions to be maintained, one or two of the most striking are almost nullified by a subsequent one. "You will be ESPECIALLY ESTEEMED, if you do not do what you would find

Jewish phraseology has, what secular Greek and Latin, prior to monotheistic influence, lacked, — a term for conscience.[21] This does not imply that heathens were devoid of moral sense, but it does indicate that conscience, or moral sense, had no recognized standing among them, else necessity would have compelled the invention of some term to express it.

The chief moralists among heathens were the Stoics, but they, as will appear in the next chapter, were but an offshoot from that monotheism which the Jews were spreading.

Jews and their converts must have measured themselves by a higher standard of morality than that established among heathens. This is evinced by their ideas of practical monotheism.[22]

---

fault with in others." — *Ad Demon.* in *Græc. Majora*, **1**, 155. "Exercise self-control [touching] all those things, — gain, anger, pleasure, grief, — whereby IT IS BASE that the soul should be mastered. But you will be such [a man] . . . if, when angry, you behave towards offenders as you would deem proper that others should behave towards yourself when you offend." — *Ad Demon.* in *Græc. Majora*, **1**, 156. Subsequently the rule is laid down : "Think it equally disgraceful to be outdone by enemies in ill offices, or by friends in benefits." — *Ad Demon.* in *Græc. Majora*, **1**, 157. This same rule is put by **Xenophon** into the mouth of Socrates : "You have known that it is a manly virtue to exceed friends in kind offices and enemies in ill ones." — *Memorabil.* **2**, 6, 35.

Cf. Exod. 23

[21] The Jews used *συνείδησις* in the sense of conscience. In secular Greek it meant merely consciousness of anything whatever. Passow gives *conscience* as a second definition, but supports it only by reference to quotations in Stobæus, a writer as late as the tenth century. The Lexicon of Facciolati and Forcellini gives *conscience* as one meaning of the Latin *conscientia*, but the references — not in all cases satisfactory — do not sustain any such meaning prior to the date of monotheistic influences at Rome.

[22] See in the Appendix, under Note B, § 1. Nos. 4, 5, 6, the meaning of Practical Monotheism. The same can be fairly inferred from advice of **Paul** : "I wish . . . that the women adorn themselves in neat attire, modestly and discreetly ; not with braids, or gold, or pearls, or costly clothing, but — as becomes women who advocate *θεοσέβειαν* monotheism — with good works." — **1 Tim. 2**, 8–10. In **Proverbs, 8**, 13, likewise, we have it stated: "Monotheism (*φόβος κυρίου*) hates injustice." And by

We have the testimony of Cicero — whose political prejudices were against the Jews — that the section of the republic wherein reason and industry were of most account was one in which we know Jewish influence to have been especially strong.[23]

Tacitus, a defamer of Judaism, testifies unintentionally to the fact, that in Syria — where the heathen religion had been rooted out by Jewish teaching — military force was superfluous and industry prosperous.[24]

Pliny, in his *Panegyrie*, while stating that indecencies, customary at heathen entertainments, were excluded from Trajan's table, enables us to perceive that Jewish entertainments were conducted yet more strictly than the emperor's.[25]

The brutalizing and otherwise demoralizing public games of heathenism were regarded by Jews and recognized

---

Sirach, 1, 14, "Monotheism (φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεὸν) is the first step in [moral] wisdom." Compare views of wisdom in Ch. III. note 25. On the words translated "monotheism," see Appendix, Note B, § 1. Nos. 1 and 11.

[23] **Cicero** wrote to his brother Quintus, who was proprætor of Asia, which province in Roman phraseology meant the western and central parts of Asia Minor. In this somewhat long letter he says: "You are not managing that portion of the republic in which chance is ruler, but [that] IN WHICH REASON AND DILIGENCE EFFECT MOST. . . . To you is given the utmost peace, the utmost tranquillity, in such degree as might overcome a sleepy governor or delight a vigilant one." — Cicero, *Ad Fratrem*, **1**, 1; *Epist.* **3**, 529, 530.

[24] **Tacitus** tells us (*An.* **13**, 35) that the troops in Syria had even forgotten how to construct a camp, and (*An.* **15**, 26) that troops diminished in numbers and broken in strength by hard service were sent thither to recruit; also (*Vit. Agric.* 40) that Syria was reserved for eminent persons, a sure evidence of its wealth.

[25] "For neither [on the one hand] do the seclusive peculiarities of Foreign Superstition, nor [on the other] does obscene buffoonery attend the Prince's table, but benignant prompting, refined jests, respect for scholarship." — **Pliny**, *Panegyric*, **49**, 8. The term Foreign Superstition means Judaism, whether it does or does not include Christianity. On this subject of indecency at heathen entertainments, see extract from Pliny in Ch. X. note 61, and from Tacitus, in the same chapter, at the close of note 59.

by heathens as essentially anti-Jewish.[26] In fact after the contest became sharp between Judaism and Heathenism at Rome, such games were always most in vogue, when the patrician or anti-Jewish element was most unrestricted.

The marriage relation must have been better observed among Jews than among heathens. The loose views and practice of the latter are well known.[27] At Rome penal enactments existed against celibacy, and legal privileges for parents of several children.[28] Heathen writers complain of, or ridicule, the mutability of the married state.[29] We do not find the same condition of things depicted among Jews by their own moralists, or objected to

---

[26] According to **Josephus**, when Herod the Great, in the time of Augustus, introduced games of this character into the city of Cæsarea, the foreigners were delighted with them. "But to the natives it was an obvious overthrow of their honored customs. For it appeared plainly heathenish to throw men to wild beasts as an amusement for a theatreful of human beings, and heathenish to exchange the divine ordinances (*θεσμούς*) for foreign usages." — Josephus, *Antiq.* **15**, 8, 1. Compare on this subject in Ch. X. notes 57, 58, 59, 60. Quotations in the last two of these imply, or accord with, the view, that opposition by any one to such games excited mistrust of his fidelity to the patrician party and to the established religion.

[27] See **Smith**, *Dict. of Antiq.* pp. 604 – 606, art. *Hetœræ.*

[28] "In order to promote marriage, various penalties were imposed on . . . celibacy. . . .

"By the *Lex Papia Poppæa* a candidate who had several children was preferred to one who had fewer. . . . Freedmen who had a certain number of children were freed . . . and *libertæ* [freed women] who had four children were released from the *tutela* [guardianship] of their patrons. . . . Those who had three children living at Rome, [or] four in Italy, and [or] five in the provinces, were excused from the office of tutor or curator. . . . The *lex* also imposed penalties on *orbi*, that is, married persons who had no children."—**Smith's** *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 692.

[29] "Will any woman blush at divorce when some who are illustrious, and of rank, count their years, not by the [annual] consulships, but by the number of their husbands." — **Seneca**, *De Benefic.* **3**, 16, 2. "Thus she has eight husbands in five autumns."— **Juvenal**, *Satire* **6**, 229, 230. "It is not more, certainly, than thirty days, and Thelesina is marrying her tenth husband."— **Martial**, *Epigram* **6**, 7.

them by their Christian or heathen opponents. The increase of Jews, moreover, testifies to a general appreciation among them of the family relation, while, in Italy at least, a perpetual immigration, without increase, of heathen population implies, that by these latter it was not appreciated.

§ II. *Accessories and Hindrances.*

1. First, certainly, among hindrances to the spread of Judaism was, if we can trust evidence, the CEREMONIAL LAW, which must here be understood in its widest sense as including all supposed commands of the Deity or of tradition, concerning observances or abstinences, not calculated to subserve moral ends. There may indeed have been weak-minded heathens, who, in proportion as they could discern no object for an observance, imagined it to be above human comprehension. There may, too, have been dishonest ones, thankful to impose on their consciences by substituting ceremonial observance instead of right living. But heathens of the better and thoughtful class found the Ceremonial Law, or some portions of it, a serious obstacle in the way of accepting Judaism. Born Jews had from childhood been familiarized to this law, so that they questioned less concerning it. Some even may have had it intertwined with early associations from which they would have regretted to part.[30] Suggestions as to its origin will be elsewhere offered.[31]

[30] Habits, essentially unimportant, may by association become almost indispensable to particular frames of mind or feeling. Two elderly ladies in different localities of Europe told me that they did not disapprove embroidery, then common as a Sunday occupation, but, owing to early formed habits, found it repugnant. To knitting they had been accustomed, and in one, at least, of these two cases, a removal of the knitting would unquestionably have interfered with Sunday thoughts. When the needles began to move Sunday-quiet settled upon the countenance. A special locality or particular strain or familiar verse, meaningless to one person, may unfailingly awaken in another some train of thought. A considerate man will not needlessly destroy a neighbor's cherished associations. Yet, if these are of a kind to impede moral sense, their propagation must be counteracted.

[31] See Ch. XIV. notes 8–12, and the text prefixed to them.

2. Another feature had become blended with Judaism which must have awakened, or nurtured, antipathy or mistrust on the part of many right-minded heathens, and by wrong-minded ones would be used as a weapon against the Jews. The OFFERINGS collected FOR THE TEMPLE at Jerusalem were, at least in times of excitement, so enormous [32] as inevitably to tempt cupidity. Unprincipled Jews and heathens must have discovered in them a means of filling their pockets, so that no small share of such offerings may never have reached Jerusalem.[33] The portion which arrived there cannot but have rendered the Temple attractive to money-lovers, and an unfavorable place, in many respects, for studying Jewish morality.[34]

[32] **Cicero** states (*Pro Flacco*, **28**) that gold was annually carried from Italy and from every Roman province to Jerusalem. He specifies that under the directions of Flaccus there had been seized of this gold at Apamea, in Asia Minor, one hundred pounds' weight (more than $25,000); at Laodicea, twenty pounds; and mentions other seizures without the amounts. If we assume what is scarcely probable, that no portion of these Temple gifts escaped the rapacity of Flaccus, yet, considering the comparative scarcity at that date of the precious metals, the contributions in some localities must have been enormous. Pilate, according to **Josephus** (*Antiq.* **18**, 3, 2), found sacred money at Jerusalem in quantity sufficient to supply the city with water. Whether his aqueduct was, as that writer states, two hundred furlongs (that is twenty-five miles) long is a point concerning which his habitual exaggeration may lead us to doubt. The same historian specifies (*Wars*, **5**, 5, 3, 4, 6) nine gates, a wall and a front of the Temple covered with silver and gold, and mentions other lavish expense in which (*Wars*, **5**, 5, 1) "all the sacred treasures replenished by tributes sent from the whole world to God" were during years or generations used up. At the outbreak of the war under Nero there were (see Appendix, Note I., foot-note 23) seventeen talents in the Temple treasury.

[33] **Josephus**, in a passage (*Antiq.* **18**, 3, 5) to which we must hereafter recur, mentions a concerted plan by four men for imposing on Fulvia, a lady of rank at Rome, who had been converted to Judaism. She gave them purple and gold for the Temple, which they appropriated to their own use. Possibly **Paul** had such practices in mind when he wrote (*Romans*, **2**, 22), "You abhorrer of idols, are you a Temple robber?"

[34] Our Saviour's words to the Temple traffickers are here apposite: "It

Even where no intentional dishonesty was surmised, a heathen might become indignant at exactions in the name of religion from women of his family,[35] and lose patience with importunity addressed to himself by such as mistook officious and objectless activity for pious zeal.

Non-ritualist Jews, if consistent, disapproved these Temple offerings and the sacrifices to which a portion of them ministered.[36] In their own synagogues, heathen listeners received a welcome. From the Temple they were excluded.[37] Fortunately, but one such building was recognized by Jews. Even within it, we can learn from the widow and her two mites how religious feeling and self-sacrifice may dwell in proximity to avarice and fraud; and a conversation between doctors and a child (Luke **2**, 46) bears evidence that religious instruction had not been wholly displaced.

Jerusalem was tainted by Temple practices, but the character of its inhabitants,[38] little known to heathens

---

is written, 'My house shall be a house of prayer,' but you have made it a 'robbers-cave.'" — **Matthew, 21**, 13.

[35] **Philo**, in his treatise on the virtues and office of ambassadors, otherwise called, *The Embassy to Caius*, Ch. 40, mentions costly gifts contributed by Julia, the daughter of Augustus.

[36] "I need not your sacrifice or libation,
Neither polluted odor [of burnt offering] nor hateful blood."
Sib. Or. 8, 390, 391.

Compare Sibyl. Orac. **2**, 82, **4**, 27-29, in Appendix, Note **A**, § II. Part A, and § VIII. The expulsion of Temple traffickers by Jesus (Matt. **21**, 12; John, **2**, 15) would have been resisted, unless many had condemned their doings. Stephen, the first Christian martyr, gave expression, doubtless (**Acts, 7**, 48), to the conviction of non-ritualists: "The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands." At this point his speech was evidently interrupted. The opinion cost him his life.

[37] Inscriptions on its pillars (**Josephus**, *Wars*, **5**, 5, 2) forbade entrance to foreigners.

[38] Jerusalem, ruled by an ecclesiastical aristocracy, and filled with a class (see Appendix, Note I., foot-notes 21, 23) brought thither by greediness, was a place where human selfishness, with its unwritten maxims, had overridden the teachings of Judaism. "Whoever swears by the temple may disregard his oath, but whoever swears by the gold of the

at a distance, cannot have materially interfered with the spread of Judaism.

3. The cause of Judaism at Rome, or wherever Roman rule extended, was more or less intermixed with that of POPULAR RIGHTS. Two reasons existed for this. The Senatorial party upheld the old religion, which was managed by the Senate.[39] It also advocated established usages, on which patrician privileges rested.[40] Judaism opposed paganism, and taught human rights. An alliance therefore naturally grew up between it and the popular party. This was better than any league with its opposite, yet its advantages were counterbalanced, at least in the city of Rome, by not a few disadvantages. Any alliance between religion and a political party not only exposes the former to blame for short-comings of the latter, but subjects the teachings of religion to perversion. Able politicians and fluent orators are not, as a rule, the best guides in matters of conscience.

4. The RELATIVE ANTIQUITY of Judaism and paganism was one of the points debated between advocates of the two religions, and also, at a later day, between Christians and heathens. More importance was attached to this discussion, because the aristocracy, anxious for their

---

temple, must keep it." — **Matthew, 23,** 16. "Whoever swears by the altar may disregard his oath, but whoever swears by the gift thereon must keep it." — **Matt. 23,** 18. If a man give to the temple (**Matt. 15,** 5; **Mark, 7,** 11) what is due to his parents, he is freed from aiding them; a convenient maxim certainly for "temple-robbers," and disgusting, doubtless, to upright Jews. In their literature we find quite opposite maxims: "Not the power of the things sworn by, but the punishment appropriate to sinners follows up the transgression of wrong-doers." — **Wisdom of Solomon, 14,** 31. "You should not accustom your mouth to an oath." — **Sirach, 23,** 9.

[39] "The gods of the Roman state were the gods of patricians alone." — **Smith,** *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 176, col. 2, art. *Augur*. Compare in Ch. VII. note 35, Cicero's opinion that augury was kept up *reipublicæ causa* for political reasons. The cause of "the republic" and of the Senate were, in patrician language, identical.

[40] The need of *Delatores*, or *Prosecutors on Shares* (see Appendix, Note C) was largely owing to patrician privileges.

political privileges, were zealous partisans of ancient usages.[41] This controversy ignored the relative merits of the two systems, and assumed that most reverence was due to the older. Where the aristocracy was strongest, namely, at Rome, this dispute seems to have had most vigor. It nurtured fictitious reverence for antiquity, which, at one period, may have swayed some Gentiles into acceptance of Judaism rather than of Christianity.[42]

5. The monotheistic teaching, in the name of SIBYLLA, imposed upon the Senate in B. C. 76, and officially accepted by that body, must in any controversy have proved very inconvenient to patrician conservatives.[43] This is confirmed by their efforts, half a century later, to destroy or prevent perusal of it, and of subsequent productions under the same name. Whether these lines, professedly from Erythræ, gave much aid to the progress of monotheism, is a different question. Sincere men of reasonable ability may, in the then existing state of opinion, have deemed them inspired. Their teaching was, in most respects, superior to what could be found in heathen literature, and their violent suppression would increase the number of their advocates. Yet critical judgments must have found much in them which betrayed their real origin. The mistrust of such minds was no slight weight in the balance against Judaism, and the connection of its cause with a fraud must have impaired its moral influence and facilitated misrepresentation by its enemies.[44]

---

[41] "You know the verse indited by a good poet, which is in every one's mouth: 'Rome, *res Romana*, stands because of old-fashioned customs and men.'" — **Marc Antonine**, Letter of, in the *Historiæ Augustæ Scriptores*, p. 73, Leipsic edit. 1774; *Avid. Cassius*, Ch. 5. **Cicero** (*De Divinat.* **2**, 112, cited in Appendix, Note A, foot-note 99) supports, by ancestral custom, the idea that Sibylline books should be withdrawn from the people. The younger **Pliny** (*Epist.* **6**, 34, quoted in Ch. X. note 108) cannot well have rested on aught save such custom.

[42] See **Juvenal**, *Satire* **14**, 96–106, cited in Ch. X. note 118.

[43] For account of this fabrication, see Appendix, Note A, § II.

[44] A work somewhat analogous in object to the Erythræan verses was the

6. Another impediment to the moral and religious influence of Judaism was, that some who professed or

---

so-called **Etruscan Teaching**, unmentioned in history, and, therefore, probably too unimportant for enumeration above. It, or the extant portion of it, has been transmitted us in the Lexicon of Suidas. The most plausible date for its fabrication would be during the conservative reaction under Claudius, though it may have been a century earlier. The Emperor's proposal (Tac. *An.* **11**, 15, hereafter quoted in Ch. VIII. § IV.) to obtain learned slaves from Etruria, might prompt, in some one of more ingenuity than principle, the idea that fabrication of Etruscan learning was not exclusively an imperial privilege, and that it might be made to teach Jewish equally as heathen ideas.

Etruscan Teaching.	Old Testament.
"Etruria and Etrurians also called Tuscans: a skilled man among them wrote history. He said that the maker of all things, God, apportioned twelve thousand years on all his creations, and that these corresponded to the twelve, so-called οἴκοις tribes.	"A thousand years, in thy sight, are as yesterday." — **Ps. 90**, 4. ["One day is with the Lord as a thousand years."— **2 Pet. 3**, 8.]
"In the First thousand years he made the heaven and the earth.	"God created the heaven and the earth . . . the First day. . . .
In the Second he made the firmament, this visible one which he called heaven.	God made the firmament . . . the Second day. . . .
In the Third, the sea and all the waters in the earth.	God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together, . . . the eve and morn were the Third day. . . .
In the Fourth, those great lights, the sun and the moon and the stars.	God made two great lights, . . . the stars also . . . the Fourth day. . . .
In the Fifth, all life of winged and creeping animals, and four-footed beasts in the air and on the earth and in the waters.	God created . . . all life of creeping things, which the waters brought forth . . . and every winged fowl . . . the Fifth day. And said, Let the earth bring forth . . . four-footed beasts and creeping things. [*This fifth day is from the Septuagint.*]

counterfeited a connection with it, made their living by ASTROLOGY and SOOTHSAYING.[45] In this direction they appear to have had a rivalry with the Egyptians,[46] which

---

In the Sixth, man.

It seems, therefore, that the first six thousand years passed before the formation of man, and the race of men will continue for the other six thousand; so that the whole time to the consummation will be twelve thousand."— **Suidas,** *Lex.* **3,** 510, art. Τυρρηνία.

God created man . . . the Sixth day." — **Genesis, 1,** 1 – 27.

["This (Gen. **2,** 2) means that, in 6,000 years, the Lord God will bring all things to a conclusion." — **Barnabas,** *Epist.* 15.]

"The [duration of the] world is divided into twelve parts." — **2 Esdras, 14,** 11, Lat. Vers.

[45] "They shall intensely suffer [unsatisfied desire], who for gain
Shall basely turn soothsayers, prolonging [this] evil time,
Who clothing themselves with the thick woolly skins of sheep,
Pretend to be Hebrews, a race whose interpreters they are not,
But prating talkers, gain-makers amid [our] sufferings.
They change their course of life, yet shall they not persuade THE JUST,
Who propitiate the all-illustrious God in their hearts."
Sib. Or. 7, 132-138.

The sheep-skin clothing of false prophets, mentioned also in Matthew, **7,** 15, was an imitation of clothing said to have been worn (see Hebrews, **11,** 37) by the persecuted prophets of earlier days. To change their course of life means to heathenize themselves.

[46] Abraham, who it must be remembered was a Chaldæan, "communicated to them [the Egyptians] arithmetic, and delivered to them the science of astronomy; for before Abraham came into Egypt they were unacquainted with those parts of learning, for that science came from the Chaldæans into Egypt."— **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **1,** 8, 2, Whiston's translation.

The elder **Pliny, 30,** 2, 1, mentions Moses as, many years after Zoroaster, the originator of one class of magicians.

Josephus states concerning himself that "in the interpretation of dreams he was competent to compare what had been ambiguously stated by the Divinity, and was not unacquainted with the predictions of the Sacred Books, being himself a priest and the descendant of priests." — *Wars,* **3,** 8, 3.

Among the works attributed to **Porphyry,** the contemporary of Origen, is a life of Pythagoras, in which a Diogenes is quoted as authority for the statement, that "Pythagoras visited the Egyptians and Arabs and the

must have lasted till the time of Marc Antonine.[47] Their opponents at Rome speak of them in this respect, as in others, disparagingly,[48] yet the identification of the terms Astrologer and Chaldæan would indicate that popular opinion assigned them a pre-eminence in this direction. Degrading, in a moral point of view, as this vocation

---

Chaldæans and the Hebrews, from whom also he thoroughly learned the interpretation of dreams."— **Porphyrius,** *De vita Pythagoræ*, 14, Amsterdam edit. 1707 (appended to Iamblichus's Life of Pythagoras).

"Originally the Assyrians,— that I may rest for authority on the earliest, — because of the magnitude of the plains where they dwelt, which opened the heavens to their inspection on all sides, observed the transits and motions of the stars. Taking note of these and of what [in after experience] was signified by each, they transmitted their knowledge. In that nation the Chaldæans, so called, not from their profession, but from their tribal designation, are thought by long observation of the stars to have created a science, through which they can predict what will happen to each one and under what fate he was born. The Egyptians are thought to have attained the same art during a lapse of time amounting to innumerable ages."— **Cicero,** *De Divinat.* **1** (1), 2.

[47] See **Suidas,** *Lexicon*, articles Arnuphis and Julian. The shower which relieved the army of Marc Antonine was by some attributed to the agency of Julian the Chaldæan, and by others to Arnuphis the Egyptian.

[48] The poet **Juvenal,** who lived in the latter half of the first century, tells us, "The groves and shrines of the sacred fountain [of Capena] are allotted to Jews, whose whole furniture is a basket and some straw. Every tree is required to pay its hire to THE PEOPLE. The Camœnæ are ejected and the grove is a beggar." — *Satire* **3,** lines 11–16. Elsewhere, after representing the Roman wives as willing to do and believe anything which an Egyptian priest may dictate, he adds, that when the priest is gone "a furtive [or trembling] Jewess, who has left her basket and straw, begs in her secret [or secret-loving] ear, 'She is an interpretess of the laws of the Jews, and a high-priestess of some tree, and a faithful medium of communication with the HIGHEST Heaven.' The wife fills her hand more sparingly. For a trifling sum a Jew will sell you any dreams which you may wish. Professing himself a soothsayer from Armenia or Commagene, he will, after examining the lungs of a newly killed dove, promise you a tender lover, or the large inheritance of a childless rich man. He inspects the hearts of chickens, and the entrails of a pup; sometimes also of a boy." —*Satire*, **6,** 542–552. This last remark will not diminish our estimate of Roman credulity, or of patrician misrepresentation.

must have been, it was one which Rome assigned, under the name of Augury or Auspices, to her chief citizens, placing them, in this respect, on a par with the refuse of Judaism.

7. If the Jews were, as Josephus claims (see Ch. IV. note 6; compare Ch. XIII. notes 27 – 29), the mechanics of the Roman Empire, this would bring them largely in contact with their heathen neighbors, and give to those of them who were fitted for it an opportunity of making a favorable impression by their skill, industry, and fidelity. Any such qualities as command respect would co-operate in diffusing their religious views. In fact, Jewish habits of industry must have been PARTLY due to Jewish religious views, to a sense of responsibility for the right use of time.

8. A negative advantage which the Jews possessed was, that nowhere outside of Judæa had their religion exclusive control of state power. It must largely, therefore, have escaped the perversions which a union of religious and secular authority is sure to entail. The limited extent to which religious and secular power were blended in the same Jewish hands at Alexandria proved unfavorable to religious sincerity. See Ch. V. § VIII. and Ch. VIII. § III. 3.

CHAPTER III.

JEWISH INFLUENCE ORIGINATES THE STOICS.

§ I. *Greek Stoics.*

ALLUSION has already been made to Jewish influence on Greek culture, a subject to which we shall return in Ch. XIII. §§ I. IV. A striking evidence of it is the body of Gentile moralists whom it called into existence; men among the most intelligent of their time in matters of jurisprudence and natural science, and who, in spite of their defects, have deserved and received the esteem of subsequent ages.

Three centuries or more before the Christian era, Judaism was already strong enough in Egypt and Syria to claim political attention as an important element in society.[1] The records of its history in Asia Minor at this date are scanty, but its strength there, two centuries later,[2] implies that it must, on the seaboard at least, have commenced about as early and made nearly or quite as much progress as in the other two countries.

Subsequently to its establishment in these countries, there grew up among heathens in Asia Minor, the islands belonging to it, and in Syria, a body of Greek teachers,[3] who nominally taught monotheism. Their affinity to Ju-

[1] In B. C. 332, when Alexandria, the commercial metropolis of Egypt, was founded, it was laid off in three sections, of which one was apportioned to the Jews (**Smith**, *Dict. of Geog.* **1**, 97, col. 1); and when Antioch, the capital of Syria, was founded in B. C. 300, equal rights of citizenship were given (**Smith**, *Dict. of Geog.* **1**, 143, col. 1) to Jews as to heathens.

[2] See, in Ch. II. note 32, mention of contributions from Asia Minor to the Jewish Temple.

[3] In ASIA MINOR and its islands were born: at *Citium in Cyprus*, Zeno the earlier and Persæus; at *Assos in Troas*, Cleanthes; at *Soli in Cilicia* (though his father was a resident of Tarsus), Chrysippus and one Athenodorus; at *Tarsus*, Zeno the later, one Antipater, two, apparently named Athenodorus, and in this city was the residence of Archedemus; in the island of *Chios*, Aristo; in the island of *Rhodes*, Panætius; in *Hierapolis, of Phrygia*, Epictetus; in *Nicomedia, of Bithynia*, Arrian.

In SYRIA, Posidonius was born at *Apamea*, though his residence, in mature life, was at Rhodes. One of the two Antipaters was born at *Tyre*. Diogenes, surnamed the Babylonian, was born at *Seleucia* on the Euphrates, adjacent to Syria on the east. A later Stoic, named Euphrates, is said by one writer to have been born at Tyre, and by another at Byzantium.

The Greek population of Syria must have been much less numerous than that of Asia Minor. Its Syrian population, if inclined to monotheism, may have united with the Jews, or, if such men became Stoics, their language may have debarred Romans from acquaintance with their views. Chæremon, librarian at Alexandria in the first half of the first century, was a Stoic. Where he originated seems unknown. The foregoing list comprises all prominent Greek Stoics and some additional ones.

daism was such, that a Pharisee could use them to illustrate the views of his sect; a heathen could ridicule them as believing in a circumcised God, and among their Roman imitators we find the belief in a King from the East,[4] while their views were so antagonistic to heathen ones as to be called *Paradoxes*. Three of these men,[5] Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus, emigrated at different times to Athens, where the first mentioned taught in a *Stoa* or porch. This caused advocates of that system in Europe, and afterwards in Asia, to be called Stoics, or Disciples of the Porch. Other advocates of the system came at still later dates to Athens.

In turning to the views and phraseology of the Stoics they need, as an aid to scrutiny, a comparison *seriatim* with those of the Jews. But, unless on points where a common origin might be surmised, the evidence of Stoicism being an imitation of Judaism, increases in, at least, geometrical ratio with each new instance of its having borrowed therefrom.

The Jews believed in one Supreme Being who created and controlled the universe. The Stoics professed a like

---

[4] "At nineteen years of age I entered upon citizenship, adhering to the sect of Pharisees, which is similar to the one called, among Greeks, *Stoic*." — **Josephus,** *Life*, § 2. "The God of the Stoics is round (as Varro says), devoid of head, and circumcised." — **De Morte Claudii Ludus, 8;** Seneca, *Opp. Philos.* **2,** 280. This was written about A. D. 54, though not by Seneca, who would not have ridiculed his own sect.

See also in Note A, footnote 96, the belief of Cicero's brother in a king from the East. On a spherical God see *Indirect Testimony*, Ch. II. note 17.

[5] Zeno was the earliest who made these views known in Europe, and has been commonly regarded as founder of the system. According to **Smith's** *Biog. Dict.* (art. *Cleanthes*), he died in B. C. 263, but according to the same work, **3,** 1314, col. 1, and to **Diogenes Laertius** (*Zeno*, 8) he was active in the one hundred and thirtieth Olympiad, as late, therefore, as B. C. 191. Cleanthes was born, according to Smith's *Biog. Dict.* (art. *Cleanthes*) about B. C. 300. Chrysippus, according to the same work (art. *Chrysippus*), was born in B. C. 280, but according to **Diogenes Laertius,** (*Chrysippus*, 7), he died in the one hundred and forty-third Olympiad, as late, therefore, as B. C. 139, after living seventy-three years. This would place his birth about B. C. 212 or B. C. 213.

belief, though some of them explained it pantheistically.[6]

The Jews believed that the heathen deities were doomed to perish. So did the Stoics.[7]

The Jews taught that heathen temples should be avoided. The Stoics also decried temples.[8]

The Jews maintained that efforts to represent the Divine Nature by images were absurd.[9] So did the Stoics,[10] differing therein from other heathens. Such Greeks and Romans as believed in any gods seem to have attributed to them a human form.[11]

---

[6] "In physics they (the Stoics) inclined to pantheism." — **New Am. Cyclopædia,** art. *Stoics.* Compare extracts from Seneca in note 61 of this chapter.

[7] "We know that the Stoics, . . . holding to one immortal and indestructible God, think that the others have been born, and will perish." — **Lamprias,** *De Orac. Defect,* 19 ; Plutarch's Works, **7,** 654. See also close of citation in note 18.

[8] "Blessed among men shall they on earth be . . . who reject all temples which they see." — **Sib. Or. 4,** 24 – 27. "Men of Athens . . . God dwelleth not in temples made with hands." — **Acts, 17,** 22 – 24. Compare Acts, **7,** 48, quoted in Ch. II. note 36. "It is a dogma of Zeno NOT TO BUILD temples of the gods, for a temple has little worth and is not holy." — **Plutarch,** *de Stoic. Repugnant.* 6, *Opp.* **10,** 280, edit. Reiske. "Zeno, founder of the Stoic sect, in his book on Civil Polity, says that temples and images SHOULD NOT BE MADE, for that nothing artificial was worthy of the gods, [possibly Clement substituted τῶν θεῶν, *of the gods,* for τοῦ θείου, *of the divine nature*], and he did not fear to write these views in the following words : 'The building of temples is needless, for a temple has little worth, and we should not deem anything holy [in the sense of *liable to pollution* by acts devoid of immorality. Compare George Campbell, *Dissertat.* **6,** Part 4], for that no [mere] work of builders and mechanics was of great worth and holy.'" — **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **5,** 77.

[9] "No man can make a god like to himself." — **Wisd. of Sol. 15,** 16. "We should not think the Divine Nature like to gold or silver or stone." — **Acts, 17,** 29.

[10] "Not from gold, not from silver ; from this material no image can be devised resembling God." — **Seneca,** *Epist.* **31,** 10.

[11] "Concerning the form [of the gods] partly nature admonishes, partly reason teaches us ; for we all of every nation have *naturally* no

Jews, excepting Sadducees, taught a resurrection. The Stoics did the same.[12]

Jews taught a heavenly city. The Stoics imitated their phraseology.[13]

The Jews, at least in Asia Minor, taught, though at how early a date cannot easily be determined, a future conflagration of the world,[14] which was to inaugurate a

---

other form for the gods than the human one. For what other form ever occurs to a man, either awake or asleep. . . . Reason declares the same, for since it seems appropriate that the most excellent nature [namely, that of the gods], either because it is blessed or because it is perpetual, should also be the most beautiful. . . . What figure, what appearance, can be more beautiful than the human. . . . Nor does reason exist save in the human figure. We must confess that THE GODS ARE IN HUMAN FORM." — **Cicero**, *De Nat. Deorum*, **1** (18), 46–48.

[12] **Clement of Alexandria** mentions the Conflagration "at which [time] (the Stoics) affirm that each individual will rise again." — *Strom.* **5**, 9. Compare *Strom.* **5**, 106. "**Chrysippus**, . . . speaking concerning the renovation of the world, introduces the following: . . . 'It is manifest that nothing is impossible [with God ?], and that we, after death, will again, after a lapse of time, be placed in the same σχῆμα [bodily] form where we now are.'" — **Lactant.** *Div. Inst.* **7**, 23. Stoics "confess a re-embodiment of . . . souls . . . and that body does not commingle with body, but that there will be a resurrection." — **Philosophum.** **1**, 21. See also Josephus, cited in note 4. The non-commingling of bodies is perhaps, though not certainly, that which Athenagoras upheld (*De Resurrect.* cc. 6, 7), that if a human body be devoured by a beast the particles essential to its resurrection are not amalgamated with, but eliminated from, the beast.

A fair inference from Acts **24**, 15, is that some Jews restricted any resurrection to the just. Some must have held (Rev. **20**, 14) that the wicked existed only until the Renovation. Among Stoics, Cleanthes maintained "that all souls endure till the conflagration, but Chrysippus, that those only of the wise [i. e. just]." — **Diog. Laert.** *Zeno*, 84. Compare Tatian, *Orat.* 6; also Dan. **12**, 2.

[13] "The Stoics call heaven, peculiarly, a city." — **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **4**, 174, *Opp.* 642. In Greek the term πόλιν for city, and πόλον for heaven, differ by but one letter.

[14] "These (the Pharisees) . . . confess . . . a future judgment and CONFLAGRATION." — **Philosophum.** **9**, 28, p. 306, edit. Miller. See, quoted in Appendix, Note D, the book of Enoch, **1**, 6, with which com-

new era. The Stoics also taught such a conflagration, and that a new era would be inaugurated by it.[15]

The Jews fixed the resurrection, or the final one, and the destruction of heathen deities, at the date of this conflagration. So did the Stoics.[16]

Indirect evidence renders probable that some Jews identified God and other spiritual natures with fire.[17]

---

pare the extract from Clement of Alexandria, already given in note 12. These views may have been prompted by such passages in the Old Testament as the following: "A fire . . . shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains." — **Deut. 32,** 22. "Our God shall come . . . a fire shall devour before him." — **Ps. 50,** 3. Compare Ps. **97,** 3. "The hills melt and the earth is burned at his presence, yea, the world and all that dwell therein." — **Nahum. 1,** 5. "My messenger . . . is like a refiner's fire." — **Mal. 3,** 1, 2. "The day cometh that shall burn as an oven." — **Mal. 4,** 1. Compare Is. **9,** 19; **10,** 17.

[15] "The Stoics . . . expect a conflagration and purification of this world; some a total, others a partial one." — **Philosophum. 1,** 21, pp. 26, 27. "The Stoic philosophers are of opinion that the whole universe shall be transformed (or cast) into fire, as into a seed, and that therefrom (or thereby) it will proceed (or be completed) in its adornment as it originally was." — **Eusebius,** *Præparatio,* **15,** 18, quoted apparently from Numenius. Compare the similar view of Heraclitus in Note K, § III. Empedocles, to whom a like view is attributed, may have travelled in Jewish countries. See also *Indirect Testimony,* last citation on p. 181.

[16] Some Jews seem to have taught two resurrections, one of the just, at the beginning of millennium, and another of the unjust, at its close. Those who held this twofold view must, as we may infer from their imitators among early Christians, have connected the judgment of men and of demons, or heathen deities, with the final resurrection. Those who held to but one resurrection, connected, doubtless, the judgment with that one. The judgment and conflagration were deemed concomitant.

The views of Stoics will be found in notes 12, 18, and 50.

[17] Certain passages in the Old Testament could be misinterpreted as implying that the substance of God was fire, and certain writers or teachers in the first or second centuries, whose views of God and angels were chiefly borrowed from Jewish representations, treat fire as the substance of the Deity or of his angels. In **Deuteronomy, 4,** 24, God is called a "consuming fire"; and in **Exodus, 3,** 2, "the angel of the Lord" (or in Exodus, **3,** 4, "the Lord") is represented as appearing

The Stoics, in speaking of their God, did, as is well known, the same.[18]

Jewish teaching was prominently moral and practical.

"in a flame of fire." The **Writer to the Hebrews**, using the Hebrew parallelism, speaks of God,

> "Who makes the SPIRITS his messengers,
> The FLAME OF FIRE his servants."
>
> **Heb. 1, 7.**

The word for *messenger* and for *angel* is identical in the original, and a comparison of verses 13, 14, in the same chapter, shows that the second line is used as an iteration of the first. The passage is a quotation, with, perhaps, alteration of meaning from Psalm **104**, 4 (LXX. **103**, 4). The author of the **Philosophumena** says (**10**, 33; p. 335, edit. Miller), "I confess that the angels are fire."

Elsewhere in that work, a heading is devoted to the Docetæ, that is, to the class of Gnostics who regarded Christ as having only an apparent, not a real, body. They are represented as stating, concerning the God who made heaven and earth: "Moses says that this πύρινον θεὸν, fiery God [i. e. this God whose substance is fire], spoke from the bush." **Philosophumena**, p. 265, edit. Miller. The author of the **Clementine Homilies**, in a passage the details of which must have been partly imitated from the Book of Enoch, speaks of the angels (Hom. **8**, 13), as having, by their fall, lost or diminished their constituent element of fire, τὰ ἐκ πυρὸς τραπέντα μέλη, and treats their children, the giants (Hom. **8**, 18), as "mongrel in race [commingled], fire [i. e. SPIRIT], of angels and SOUL of women." The word for *soul* is here its synonyme αἷμα, concerning which see *Underworld Mission*, pp. 91, 92, (87, 88).

[18] Chrysippus "thinks that no one of the gods except FIRE is imperishable, but that all [others] have alike been born and will [therefore?] perish. These positions are, to express it in one word, everywhere alleged by him."—**Plutarch**, *De Stoic. Repugnant.* c. 38; (*Opp.* **10**, 346). The Stoics had several names for this sole imperishable, impersonal god. One of these names was Jupiter, as will be seen in the following extract: "Chrysippus and Cleanthes having, to express it in one word, included heaven, earth, air, and sea in the category of gods, have left no one of these imperishable, or everlasting, except Jupiter [by transformation], into whom they use up all the others. . . . They say expressly that all the gods have been born and will perish by fire, being melted, according to them, as if of wax or tin."—**Plutarch**, *Adv. Stoic*, c. 31; *Opp.* **10**, 431, 432. On this use of the word *Jupiter* some comments will be added in the course of the present section.

The Nabatheans south of Judæa, if we can trust Strabo (*Geog.* **16**, 4,

So was that of the Stoics, which, in this respect, formed a marked contrast with such other heathen literature as was not borrowed from themselves.[19]

Jews taught a *πρόνοια*, a providing and superintending care on the part of the Deity which nothing in the universe escaped.[20] The same idea, expressed by the same term, was a favorite with Stoics.[21]

The belief in a Moral Ruler of the universe, omnipresent and on whom everything depended, caused in the Jewish mind questions concerning the origin of evil,[22] especially of moral evil. If God were not its author, he could not be author of all things, nor apparently even their controller. Yet to deem him its author was to shock moral

---

26, p. 784; or edit. Meineke, p. 1094, lines 10 – 12), worshipped the sun, and would seem therefore to have shared the belief that the essence of the Divine Nature was fire. So, as is well known, did the Guebres of Persia. The Nabatheans, Guebres, and Stoics were all three in local contact with the Jews, but not with each other. It is more probable, therefore, that their belief spread, with or without corruption, from the Jews to themselves, than that it spread from one of themselves to nations and bodies who had little connection with its place of origin.

[19] **Cicero**, in his *De Officiis*, looked to Stoic literature as his storehouse. The article on Cicero in Smith, *Dict. of Biog.* **1**, 731, col. 2, after enumerating a list of Stoic writers from whom he borrowed, adds: "Notwithstanding the express declaration of Cicero to the contrary, we cannot, from internal evidence, avoid the conclusion, that the Greek authorities have, in not a few passages, been translated verbatim."

[20] "Thy providence (*πρόνοια*), O Father, pilots constantly."—**Wisd. of Sol. 14**, 3. Elsewhere the same writer speaks of the Egyptians when darkness covered their land: "These [would-be] escapers from eternal superintending care (*πρόνοια*) lay shut up under their roofs, chained by darkness and shackled by a long night."— **Wisdom of Solomon, 17**, 2.

[21] One book of Chrysippus was, according to Plutarch (*De Stoic. Repugnant.* c. 39; *Opp.* **10**, 348), entitled *περὶ προνοίας*, "Concerning Providence." Cicero (*De Nat. Deorum*, **1**, 8 or 18) represents one of his speakers as ridiculing the *πρόνοια*, or Providence of the Stoics. Compare, in this chapter, note 62, line 3, and conclusion of note 75: also Plutarch, *De Stoic. Repugnant.* cc. 9, 21, 30, 31 (?), 34, 38 (*Opp.* **10**, 284, 319, 320, 334, 335 (?), 340, 342, 345); and *Adv. Stoic.* cc. 2, 14, 36 (*Opp.* **10**, 373, 396, 440).

[22] "Shall there be evil upon the city and Jehovah not have done it?" **Amos, 3**, 6, Noyes's trans.

sense.[23] The Stoics, in borrowing from the Jews their views of God, received also this question.[24] Other heathens, who regarded their deities as limited beings capable of indifference, or malevolence towards men, or who disbelieved their existence, found in human suffering and sin no ground for such a query.

The Jews used the term *wisdom* almost as a technical one to denote moral intelligence.[25] The same expression

---

[23] Exceptional Jews attribute this prompting of moral evil to God, others to Satan, others to fallen angels or to a man's own heart. "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, 'Go number Israel.'"—**2 Sam. 24**, 1. "Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel."—**1 Chron. 21**, 1.

The **Wisdom of Sirach** tells us: "You should not say that 'because of the Lord [planning it] I fell away.' For will you not be doing what he hates? You should not say that he misled me. . . . He placed before you fire and water. You stretch out your hand to which you wish. . . . He commanded no one to heathenize and has licensed no one to sin."—**Sirach, 15**, 11–20. The utterance of James was not over a newly arisen question: "Let no one, when tempted, say, 'I am tempted of God.' For God feels no temptation towards wrong, nor does he tempt any one. But the temptation of each one consists in his being drawn aside and entrapped by his own inclinations."—**James, 1**, 13, 14. In the Appendix, Note D, will be found a view from the Jewish Book of Enoch, that evil was caused by unfaithful angels; and in foot-note 9 of the same, some other writer's indignant comment upon the supposition.

[24] "O Divine Being, NO ACTION takes place without you on earth
Nor in the divine ethereal heaven, nor on the sea,
EXCEPT what the wicked accomplish by their senselessness.
You ornament what is rude, and unlovely things are lovely to you;
For thus you have fitted all things into a whole, good things into evil ones."

Cleanthes, *Hymn*, lines 15–19.

Compare Plutarch, *Adv. Stoic.* quoted in Ch, I. note 3.

The accounts transmitted to us concerning Cleanthes as slow of mind, do not accord with the diction of this hymn and of extracts in Clement of Alexandria. Perhaps some more poetic mind may have embodied into it the ideas, and appended to it the name, of Cleanthes, or our accounts of him may be incorrect.

[25] "The fear of the Lord, that is WISDOM and to depart from evil is understanding."—**Job, 28**, 28. "The mouth of the JUST bringeth forth

became prominent among the Stoics, but not among other heathens in the same sense.[26]

In Jewish phraseology moral delinquency is not infre-

WISDOM." — **Proverbs, 10**, 31. "Incline thine ear unto wisdom. . . . Then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord. . . . For the Lord giveth wisdom."— **Proverbs, 2**, 2–6. "Wisdom crieth . . . they . . . did not choose the fear of the Lord. They would none of my counsel ; they despised all my reproof." — **Proverbs, 1**, 20–30. "Doth not wisdom cry . . . my mouth shall speak truth, and wickedness is an abomination to my lips. All the words of my mouth are in righteousness." — **Proverbs, 8**, 1–8. Compare Sirach, **1**, 14, quoted in Ch. II. note 22. In Proverbs, **8**, 22–31, wisdom is vividly personified as a companion of the Deity.

[26] "This, I know, is plain to you, Lucilius, that no one can live happily, nor even tolerably, without applying himself to WISDOM and that a happy life is effected by perfect, a tolerable one by even incipient, WISDOM." — **Seneca**, *Epist.* **16**, 1.

"Some have deemed the question proper concerning LIBERAL STUDIES whether they would make a man good. They do not even promise, nor aim at, a knowledge of this." — **Seneca**, *Epist.* **88**, 2.

Plutarch speaks of the Stoic wise man as transferred, in Stoic opinion, "from extreme wickedness to extreme virtue." — *Adv. Stoic.* c. 8 (*Opp.* **10**, 382).

Cicero quotes Cleanthes and Chrysippus as maintaining that "only the wise man is king, dictator [μόναρχος?], and rich." — *De Fin.* **4** (3), 7. He also quotes Stoic Paradoxes, of which the fifth reads: "Only the [morally] wise man is free, and every foolish man is a slave." — *Opp. Philos.* **1**, 520; and the sixth, "Only the [morally] wise man is rich." — *Opp. Philos.* **1**, 533. In arguing for a preceding paradox from a Stoic's point of view, he treats "the wise man's mind" as "surrounded by all the virtues as by walls." — *Opp. Philos.* **1**, 511.

Seneca, sometimes at least, uses *philosophy*, not in its heathen sense, but as meaning *love of moral wisdom*. See *Epist.* **89**, 4, 5 ; **90**, 1 ; **95**, 12, 13. Cicero, when quoting or defending Stoic ideas, uses it in the same way. See his *De Offic.* **2** (2), 5 ; *De Leg.* **1** (22), 58. Seneca, in his *Epist.* **89**, 7, defines it as a "Zeal for Virtue."

The grandiloquent definition of wisdom as "the knowledge of things divine and human, and of the causes by which these are controlled "— see Plutarch, *De Plac. Philos.* Book **1**, Preface (*Opp.* **9**, 468); Seneca, *Epist.* **89**, 4 ; Cicero, *De Offic.* **2** (2), 5 ; and *Tusc. Quæst.* **4** (26), 57 — was probably intended by some of the Stoics for such as could not appreciate the grandeur of simple moral excellence.

quently termed lack of wisdom, or of understanding, folly or senselessness.[27] In our scanty remnants of the Greek Stoics we find it designated in the same way.[28]

The Jews used the Greek term LOGOS, commonly meaning WORD, DISCOURSE, or REASON, in a peculiar sense, to designate any utterance of the Divine Will or agency of the Deity, though without understanding by it apparently anything which could be PERMANENTLY separated, except in imagination, from God himself.[29] Among the Stoics we find the same or a similar use of this word.[30]

The Jews used the term LAW, in the singular, to designate the DIVINE will or enactment. A similar use of it prevailed among Stoics, but not, apparently, among other heathens.[31]

---

[27] "Foolish men (ἀσύνετοι) shall not attain her (Wisdom) and sinners shall not see her." — **Sirach, 15,** 7. "God loves nothing which does not dwell with wisdom. . . . Wickedness shall not prevail against wisdom." — **Wisdom of Solomon, 7,** 28–30; **10,** 8, 9. "The Lord loves those who love her." — **Sirach, 4,** 14; **14,** 20. "Fools make a mock at sin." — **Prov. 14,** 9.

[28] See Hymn of Cleanthes, line 17, quoted in note 24. The fourth Stoic paradox quoted by Cicero (*Opp. Philos.* **1,** 510) reads, "Every [morally] foolish man is insane." Compare the fifth paradox, in note 26.

[29] See quotations in Ch. XI. note 59, from the Wisdom of Solomon. The way to this bold personification may have been paved by such earlier passages as the following: "By the LOGOS of God were the heavens set fast." — **Ps. 32 (33),** 6. God "sent his LOGOS and healed them." — **Ps. 106 (107),** 20. — In the **Sibylline Oracles, 3,** 20, God is spoken of, "who created all things by his Logos."

[30] The following is from the Hymn of **Cleanthes**:

"All things in nature are moved (literally shudder) by thy impulse,
Whereby thou guidest that pervading agency (LOGOS) which through all things
Is intermingled." Lines 12–14.

A grammatical difficulty, which cannot seriously affect the sense, is treated in the foregoing as it is by the Latin translator. In line 20, after a mention of the deity as having conjoined good with evil, the writer adds, "So that ONE may become moving agency (LOGOS) of all things ever-existing," or "of the ever-existing universe."

[31] The Hymn of **Cleanthes** speaks of the divine nature (line 2) as "piloting all things by Law," and again mentions the —

Jews held that human enactments should conform to this law. Stoics, as will appear in Ch. VII. § IX. taught the same.

In Jewish writings the Deity is figuratively represented as a pilot.[32] In the hymn of Cleanthes the same figure of speech twice occurs.

A play upon words, common to Jews and Stoics, is subjoined,[33] since it is not wholly without bearing on the question of mental intercourse between the two.

The same may be said of a similitude, common in Jewish literature,[34] which Stoics applied, apparently in contempt, to the perishable heathen deities.[35] The absence

---

"Unfortunates who, constantly desiring the possession of good things,
Do not regard the all-pervading Law of God, nor hearken to it,
By obeying which with their understanding, they would have an excellent life." Lines 22–24.

Perhaps δύσμοροι (unfortunates) may in the above have been mentally associated with δύσμωροι (utterly foolish). Compare notes 13, 33, and the use of *mωrari* in Sueton. *Nero*, **33**. Again in the same production we have the statement:

"There is no greater honor to mortals
Nor to gods, than perpetually to hymn, with justice, the all-pervading Law." Lines 35, 36, (36, 37).

In the above passages the Greek word κοινὸν (common), meaning common to the whole universe, seems best rendered by *all-pervading*.

[32] **Wisd. of Sol. 14**, 3, quoted in note 20.

[33] "Ἔσται κόσμος ἄκοσμος." — **Sibyl. Orac. 7**, 123. "κοσμεῖς ἄκοσμα." — Hymn of **Cleanthes**, line 18, already quoted. Such a play on words seems to have been not uncommon among at least one class of Jews. See Δῆλος ἄδηλος, Σάμος ἄμμος, Ῥώμη ῥύμη. — **Sibyl. Orac. 3**, 363, 364; **4**, 91, 92; **8**, 165, 166.

[34] The phrase *melting like wax* is applied to the wicked, perishing from God's presence, **Ps. 68**, 2, and, in the Septuagint, **57**, 9. Also to the hills, **Ps. 97**, 5; **Micah, 1**, 4, and, in the Septuagint, **Is. 64**, 2; **Judith, 16**, 15. Also to the heart, **Ps. 22**, 14. In the Book of Enoch, **1**, 6, the same simile is applied to what shall occur in the day of judgment; the Greek words τηκόμενον ὡς κηρὸς (edit. Laurence, 2, 211, § X.) correspond with the Septuagint phraseology.

[35] See citation from Plutarch, in note 18. The Greek words there used, τήκτους . . . ὥσπερ κηρίνους, are merely different forms of those occurring in the Greek Old Testament and in the Book of Enoch.

of respect towards these beings implied in the similitude is even more indicative of Jewish influence than the similitude itself.

The Jewish argument applied to the heathen deities, that whatever is born must also perish, seems implied in the juxtaposition of the two ideas by the Stoics.[36]

The argument common to Jews and Stoics, that evidence of design in the universe proved the existence of an intelligent Creator, will be considered in the next section.

The name Jupiter, as one among Stoic appellations for the Deity, must not be regarded as implying anything in common between their god and the chief deity of their heathen cotemporaries. It would be as reasonable to confound the *Shang-te* of Christian missionaries with that of the Chinese.[37]

The appellation *Father*, applied by them to the Supreme Being, was borrowed from Jews. It must not be understood in any sense common among heathens, nor yet perhaps in the sense to which Christianity has given prominence. Heathens used it to express the dignity or authority of Jupiter as ruling head over the family of gods.[38] Jews used it in two senses. They designated by it the parental affection of the Deity towards his earthly children, or towards such of them as worshipped him.[39]

---

[36] See the Jewish argument in the Proem to the Sibylline Oracles, Fragment II. line 1, of Friedlieb's edit., or line 39 of Alexandre's quoted in the Appendix, Note A, § II. Part A. The same argument as implied by Stoic leaders has already been quoted in note 18.

[37] See Ch. I. note 2. The same reasons which weighed with such men as Morrison, Medhurst, Stronach, and others, to call the Supreme Being *Shang-te*, might influence the Stoics in calling him *Jupiter*.

[38] The idea that control is the prominent feature in a father, has been retained in European political phraseology. Belgium, in answer to a request of Prussia, replied: "Our government is not paternal; we have no power to control free thought or free speech." — **Evening Post** (Weekly), (N. Y.), April 28, 1875.

[39] "A father of the fatherless . . . is God."
Ps. 68, 5.

"These [thy followers] thou didst test, disciplining them as a father,

They also designated by it the relation of the Deity towards the universe as its origin, source, or parent.[40] In this latter sense the Stoics used it. If any of them applied it to the Deity in the former sense, we have at least no indubitable record of such use.

A question — natural if the Stoics originated in Jewish influence and equally so if they did not — is, "Why did

---

but the others [the Egyptians] thou didst, as a destroying monarch, thoroughly search out with thy condemnation." — **Wisd. of Sol. 11,** 10 (or in the Septuagint, **11,** 11). Compare **14,** 3, quoted in note 20.

> "As a father pitieth his children,
> So the Lord pitieth THEM THAT FEAR HIM."
> **Ps. 103,** 13.

> "Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth,
> Even as a father the son in whom he delighteth."
> **Prov. 3,** 12, Noyes's trans.

> "I have become a father to Israel,
> And Ephraim is my first-born."
> **Jeremiah, 31,** 9, Noyes's trans.

Liberalist Jews may have deemed the Deity parentally thoughtful for others than his worshippers. Such a view might well be prompted by passages in the Old Testament (see Levit. **19,** 34, Deut. **10,** 18, 19, quoted on pages 21, 22), even if precedence were conceded, as in 1 Tim. **4,** 12, to believers.

[40] In modern phraseology we speak of a man as "father of a cause," "father of a denomination," "father of a project," meaning its originator. Idleness is termed the parent of vice; that is its source. **Sirach** (**23,** 1 and 4) applies to the Deity the term "Father of my life," meaning, apparently, its author. The Jewish term γενετὴρ, Forefather, Originator (see Ch. I. note 4), corresponds nearly in meaning with the foregoing use of Father. Plato's use of the latter term (see Note K, § 11. No. 7) was probably borrowed from the Jews. Compare Seneca's definition of the term "Father" in note 71.

Philo repeatedly speaks of God as the Father and Maker of the world, using the term *Father*, to mean Originator or Author. See *Against Caius*, cc. 16, 36 (pp. 693, line 18, 726, line 26, Paris edit.); *On the Creation*, c. 2 (p. 2, line 2, Paris edit.); *On the World*, cc. 1, 2 (Bohn's trans. **4,** 182, 183); *On* [*the*] *Monarchy*, Paris edit. 556, line 10; and *On Abraham*, in Pfeiffer's edit. **5,** 234, line 18. If any one of these works be not Philo's, then the evidence contained in it is from an additional writer.

they originate in Asia Minor and Syria, but not in Egypt? The answer is, that in Alexandria, the chief school of Egypt, imagination and taste seem to have found more favor than simple statements and endeavors at accurate reasoning. The same cause, which, at a later date, precluded foothold in that city to the Marcionites, or Gnostics of Asia Minor,[41] would have rendered it a difficult field for Stoics.

§ II. *Roman Stoics.*

Among Roman Stoics we find additional points of union with Judaism. The Jews had, subsequently at least to B. C. 63, taught the coming of a King, or Messiah, who, to Europe, would have been a King from the East.[42] Cicero, writing in B.C. 44 or 43, puts into the mouth of his Stoic brother Quintus, as already mentioned, an expression of belief in a KING FROM THE EAST.[43]

Again certain unmistakably Jewish books were in circulation attributed to Sibylla. Cicero represents his brother as defending the claim of these books to foreknowledge.[44]

The exclusion of Stoics from public affairs (see Ch. I. note 31), and their expulsion from Rome shortly after the capture of Jerusalem,[45] corroborate their affiliation with

---

[41] See in Ch. XI. § I. No. 1, the differing characteristics of Marcionites and Valentinians, the Gnostics of Asia Minor and of Alexandria.

[42] See Ch. VI. § II. No. 1, and Sibylline extract in Appendix, Note A, foot-note 96.

[43] See Appendix, Note A, foot-note 96.

[44] See in Appendix, Note A, foot-notes 96, 97, and the text prefixed to them.

[45] The reign of Vespasian was a coalition between himself, as leader of the popular party, and Mucianus, as leader of the moderate patricians. The expulsion of Stoics originated with the latter, and took place in the year following the capture of Jerusalem.

"Because Demetrius the Cynic, and many others, prompted by what are called Stoic doctrines and misusing the pretence of philosophy, discussed continually and publicly, to such as might be present, unsuitable things, and thus almost distracted some, MUCIANUS PERSUADED VESPASIAN to expel all such from the city, saying [to that end] many things

Judaism. Their subsequent expulsion, or alleged expulsion, under Domitian, admits more question as to whether it were effected by the emperor or, during his absence, by the aristocracy.[46]

The Noachic deluge is treated in the Book of Enoch and in the Sibylline Oracles as a thing of the past, which Noah had foretold, whilst in both works a conflagration is represented as yet future. Quintus Cicero, in the passage already referred to, whilst maintaining that some were endued with ability to FOREKNOW "floods[47] and the con-

---

against them out of anger rather than from love of learning, and Vespasian immediately expelled from Rome all the philosophers except Musonius." — **Dio Cass. 66,** 13, *Opp.* **4,** 226, edit. Sturz. The teachings which "almost distracted some" may have been concerning Rome's destruction or the end of the world, both of which were at that date subjects of popular anxiety. **Lucan** anticipated the conflagration with the confidence of a Second-Adventist. "Whether the corpses [of the slain at Pharsalia] shall perish by corruption, or by the funeral pyre, is of no consequence. Nature reassumes all things in her placid bosom. . . . If, Cæsar, the fire should not burn these [various] peoples now, it will burn them together with the earth, it will burn them together with the abysses of the sea. A funeral pyre remains for them in common with the world, [a pyre] which shall commingle the stars with their bones." —*Pharsalia*, **7,** 809 – 815.

The Musonius, excepted above, though firm in a needed prosecution (**Tac.** *Hist.* **4,** 10, 40), would, in averting a recourse to arms (**Tac.** *Hist.* **3,** 81), have earned credit with a peace society.

[46] **Dio Cassius**, who in the preceding note identifies philosophers and Stoics, subsequently narrates certain events under Domitian, to which his editor has affixed, in the margin, the date of A. D. 95. His narrative says: "Many others were PUT TO DEATH under this same charge of philosophy, and all the remaining [philosophers] were AGAIN expelled from Rome." — **Dio Cass. 67,** 13, (Vol. **4,** 278). In the next paragraph is mentioned the condemnation of Christians, or of Judaizing Gentiles. These two events, however, are complicated with a contest between Domitian and the aristocracy, to which we must hereafter recur.

[47] The mention of floods in the plural may be owing either to a current tradition, among heathens, of a flood called Deucalion's, not admitting identification with Noah's, or to the existence of different Sibylline fragments, which mentioned or alluded to the flood in ways that created a belief in more than one.

flagration of heaven and earth, which is to take place at some future time," speaks only of the latter event as IN THE FUTURE.

A reasonable inference from the Second Epistle of Peter is, that, among Jews, a belief had previously gained currency in some co-relation between the flood and conflagration.[48] A similar inference concerning Stoics would be less certain, yet among Roman Stoics the two events are constantly mentioned in juxtaposition.

There was one Roman Stoic, faithful in the main to his sect, who had his own reasons, soon to be given, for eschewing any identification with Judaism. This was Seneca. Whatever prominence he may have mentally given to the conflagration,[49] yet in his writings we find precedence, in length of statement, accorded to floods. We find them among future equally as among past events. And both they and conflagrations are represented as natural events periodically occurring.[50] His mention of con-

---

[48] "The THEN EXISTING world, by being flooded with water, was destroyed, but THE PRESENT heaven and earth are by His command treasured up for fire, being reserved to a day of judgment and destruction upon men who ignore God."—**2 Pet. 3**, 6, 7.

[49] In note 71, the simile of Hercules alludes only to conflagrations.

[50] "Unless I falsify, water meets those who dig into the earth, and, as often as avarice sends us underneath, or any cause compels us to penetrate deeper [than usual], water puts an end to digging. Add to this that immense lakes are hidden below, and a mass of hidden sea, a mass of rivers running down through unseen places. On every side therefore there will be causes for a deluge, since some waters flow through the earth, others flow around it, [both] which, long restrained, will get the upper hand. Rivers will join with rivers, ponds with marshes. At that time the sea will fill the sources of all fountains and will set them free with a wider mouth. . . . The earth will dissolve and, while other causes are at rest, will find within itself the means of submersion. Thus I should believe that all masses will become one.

"NEITHER WILL THIS DESTRUCTION BE LONG DELAYED. Concord [of the earth's component parts] is already strained and giving way, *tentatur divelliturque*. When once the world shall have relaxed somewhat from this requisite diligence [in holding things to their place], immediately and from every side, from what is visible and from what is hidden, from

flagrations in the plural may be due to a desire of advocating natural laws,[51] or of differing from Judaism, or to both. Seneca was but a youth during the anti-Jewish storm of

above and from beneath, an irruption of waters will take place. Nothing is so violent and without self-restraint, so ungovernable and injurious to those who would restrain it, as a violent mass of water. It will use the permitted liberty, and will fill what it now divides and flows round. As fire originating in different places will quickly make one conflagration, the flames hastening to unite, thus in a moment the overflowing seas will co-operate.

"That license to the waters, however, will not be perpetual. But when the destruction of the human race shall have been accomplished and the wild beasts also, whose dispositions men had adopted, shall have perished, the earth will again absorb the waters. Nature will compel the sea to rest, or else to rage within its own bounds. The ocean, thrown back from our abodes, will be driven to what is specially its own, and the ancient order [of things] will be recalled. Every [species of] animal will be generated anew; and to the earth MAN WILL BE GIVEN IGNORANT OF CRIMES AND BORN UNDER BETTER AUSPICES. But among them also innocence will only last whilst they are [a] new [set]. Wickedness creeps in promptly. Virtue is difficult of attainment; it needs a superintendent and guide. Vices are learned even without a teacher." — **Seneca**, *Nat. Quæst.* **3**, 30, 2–7 (*Opp. Philos.* **5**, 367–369). Cp. *Nat. Quæst.* **3**, 29, 4–8.

Seneca's idea, that the "concord" between different constituent parts of the earth was already giving way, will receive illustration from his explanation of earthquakes, in his *Natural Questions*, **6**, 10, 2 (*Philosophical Works*, **5**, 555), namely, that portions of the earth — supports apparently of this upper surface — were giving away with age, and that the concussion of their fall caused earthquakes. Compare also his moralizing on this subject in Ch. VIII. in a note at the commencement of § VII. The belief of Seneca in an EARLY renovation of the earth may have been, and in all probability was, strengthened by that popular anticipation of such an event, which seems to have been chiefly kindled and nourished by Jews. The reappearance of mankind upon the earth was but a modified statement of the "RESURRECTION." "We, according to His announcement (**Is. 65**, 17, **66**, 22), expect new heavens and a new earth in which dwelleth righteousness." — **2 Peter, 3**, 13. Compare Book of Enoch, quoted in Appendix, Note D, § V.

[51] "The deluge, which, equally as winter or summer, comes by a law of the world." — **Seneca**, *Nat. Quæst.* **3**, 29, 3 (*Opp. Philos.* **5**, 364). Compare in note 68 his views on the relation of omens to natural laws. See also p. 150 n.; *Ind. Testimony*, foot of p. 181; Tatian, *Orat.* 6.

A. D. 19, and seems to have needed precautions against being subjected to its violence.[52] When the patrician party, in A. D. 41, regained power, he was banished,[53] and though recalled in A. D. 49, he must have been conscious that the patricians deemed him an unreliable, or untrue, member of their body, on whom they would be glad to wreak their animosity.[54] His precarious position did not, however, prevent him from maintaining the perishable nature of the gods,[55] nor from ridiculing reactionary movements in their honor, though it may have prompted him to accompany this latter procedure with a fling at Judaism.[56]

Allusion has already been made to the argument from evidence of design in proof that an intelligent Being formed the world. Jewish literature furnishes more than one appeal to this argument.[57] Stoic teaching again resembles or imitates it. Heathen teaching, with slight exception, does not. The exception bears, though in less degree than Stoicism, the marks of Jewish influence.[58] No terser statement of the argument could well be

---

[52] See Seneca, *Epist.* **108**, 21, 22, cited in Ch. VIII. § 1. note 9.

[53] Compare in Ch. V. notes 9 and 10, and the text belonging to them.

[54] See in Ch. V. note 9, Seneca's affirmation of risk consequent on any openly manifested disapproval of public games or brutalities.

[55] **Seneca,** speaking of a wise man condemned to solitude, thinks that he would be "such as Jupiter, when on the dissolution of the world and the blending of gods into one chaos, he, during the temporary cessation of nature, is content with himself, being given up to his own reflections." — *Epist.* **9**, 13.

[56] See on pp. 67, 226, 228, citations by **Augustine** (*De Civitate Dei*, **6**, 10, 11) from **Seneca,** *Against Superstitions.*

[57] "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see?" — **Ps. 94**, 9. "For the mass of men (*literally*, all men) are heedless by nature [in that] they were ignorant of God, and unable to know THE BEING from his visible benefits, neither by studying his works did they recognize the artist." —**Wisd. of Sol. 13**, 1. "Nor yet are they to be pardoned, for if they had so much knowledge that they could examine the world, why did they not sooner discover its master?" — **Wisd. of Sol. 13**, 8, 9. Compare Rom. **1**, 20, 21.

[58] See Appendix, Note K, § 1. 2–5, § 11. 1–9.

framed than that which Cicero puts into the mouth of the Stoic Balbus.[59]

§ III. *General Remarks.*

That any set of men should be pantheists, that is, should identify God and the world, or ascribe to the world the attributes of an intelligent Being, would be a singular feature in human history.[60] Yet the Stoics have been commonly regarded as doing this, and passages in some of their writers bear out the statement.[61] Other

---

[59] Balbus alludes to a planetarium which had been lately constructed by his friend Posidonius, so as to imitate, with each revolution, the motion of the sun, moon, and five — then known — planets, and asks: "If any one should take this sphere to Scythia or Britain, . . . who among the Barbarians could doubt that it had been perfected *ratione*, by INTELLIGENCE? And yet they doubt concerning the world from which all things originate, and by which they are made, whether IT be the result of chance, or necessity, or of a divine reason and mind, and have a higher opinion of Archimedes for imitating, than of Nature for creating, the revolutions of the sphere." — **Cicero**, *De Natura Deorum*, **2**, (34, 35), 88. Balbus had already argued, in § 18, that the world was endowed with wisdom and reason. We shall find in Ch. VII. § 1. that the discussion, of which this forms a part, is, by its author, identified in time with the arrival of a monotheistic manuscript in Rome. Posidonius (or Poseidonius) was a Stoic teacher and student of natural science, resident at Rhodes, a Syrian by birth, as already mentioned in note 3.

[60] The identification of God with the world implies, of course, either that the Deity lacks consciousness and intelligence, or that the world possesses both. It seems out of the question for any sane man to hold this latter view, to believe that the earth which he digs, the water wherein he cooks his meals, and the stone or wood out of which he constructs his home, have either intelligence or consciousness. The word *God* applied to what has neither thought nor feeling seems a senseless misnomer.

[61] "What is God? The mind of the universe. What is God? All which you see, and all which you do not see." — **Seneca**, *Nat. Quæst.* Preface to Book **1**, §§ 11, 12. "Do you wish to call him Fate? You will not err. . . . Do you wish to call him Providence? You will say rightly. . . . Do you wish to call him Nature? You are committing no fault. Do you wish to call him the World? You will not be de-

passages, even in the same writers, conflict with it.[62] Not improbably their minds fluctuated on the subject. They did not share Jewish belief in a revelation which had man's moral improvement for its object, and, without this, a hindrance existed to believing in a MORAL ruler of the universe. Yet, if the deity were divested of moral attributes, a firm faith in his personal, intelligent existence was unlikely to endure. In such Stoics as associated much with Jews, the conception of God as a personal being may have predominated. The minds of others may have alternately retreated from objections to deeming him, on the one hand, a personal being, or, on the other, a mere force inherent in matter.[63]

Any belief in a PHYSICAL resurrection was likely to find more advocates among Stoics of Asia Minor or Syria than in western localities where Jews exercised less influence. The Greek word for a resurrection, *ἀνάστασις*, admits the

---

ceived, for he is all which you see."— **Seneca**, *Nat. Quæst.* **2**, 45, 1, 2. Compare in Appendix, Note A, foot-note 32, Virgil's pantheistic imitation of a monotheistic document.

[62] See, for instance, the detailed statement in **Seneca**, *De Beneficiis*, Book **4**, chapters 5, 6. In his *Natural Questions*, **2**, 45, 2, he speaks of God "by whose spirit we live," and says in his *Epistle* **65**, 24, "All things consist of matter AND of God. . . . But that which makes — namely, God — is more powerful and precious than matter, which is subject to God." **Plutarch**, quotes (*De Stoic. Repugnant.* 39; *Opp.* **10**, 348) from Chrysippus that Jupiter AND the world are the only gods which need no nourishment; and again on the same page, that "Jupiter will increase until he shall destroy all things by absorption into himself."

[63] **Seneca** says: "WHETHER the world be a soul, OR a body under the guidance of nature, as trees and plants are." — *Nat. Quæst.* **3**, 29, 2; *Opp.* **5**, 364. There is a visible difference between a living tree or plant and a dead one. Persons destitute of belief in a personal Deity, through whose aid all things live and move and have their being, recognize in the vitality of a tree or plant some force unconscious of its own existence. Its operations are not hap-hazard, and in so far seem intelligent. Yet it lacks the chief traits of an intelligent being. This force, unconscious of its own existence, was, in most cases perhaps, what European Stoics meant when they used the word *God*.

meaning re-establishment, and could therefore be applied to a renovation of the earth and of mankind as taught by Seneca.

Thoughtful Stoics may have fluctuated on several points. Seneca at one period of his life evinced strong faith in a future conscious existence.[64] At other times he speaks doubtfully.[65]

A document of which, under the name of Hystaspes, a mention will be found in the Appendix, Note A, § IX. renders it not improbable that some Stoics taught a judgment.

On the subject of omens and divination the earlier Stoics coincided with heathen,[66] rather than Jewish views, at least if by Jewish we understand the views of the more conscientious. Monotheism does not preclude belief in

---

[64] "When that day comes which shall separate this mixture of the divine and human, I shall leave my body here where I found it. . . . I am detained in an oppressive earthly prison. By these delays of an earthly age a prelude is given to that better and longer life. . . . We are maturing for another birth. . . . We cannot bear heaven until after an interval [of preparation]."—**Seneca**, *Epist.* **102**, 22, 23.

[65] "Death either destroys us or sets us free."—**Seneca**, *Epist.* **24**, 18. "Perhaps if—only the saying of the wise be true, and if some locality awaits us—he whom we regard as perished has been sent before us."—**Seneca**, *Epist.* **63**, 13. "Death is either our end or a transition."—**Seneca**, *Epist.* **65**, 26.

[66] "But whereas the Stoics argued for all such things because Zeno had scattered certain seeds thereof, as it were, in his commentaries, and Cleanthes had slightly developed them, there supervened Chrysippus, a man of most acute genius, who explained his whole opinion concerning divination in two books, with yet another concerning oracles, and one concerning dreams. Following him, his auditor, Diogenes of Babylon, issued one book; Antipater, two; our Posidonius, five. But Panætius, the leader in that sect, the teacher of Posidonius, the disciple of Antipater, degenerated from [the positions of] the Stoics. Yet even he did not dare to deny the ability to divine, but said that he doubted. What it was lawful in one thing for HIM, a Stoic, to do, in spite of the utter disinclination of the Stoics generally, ought not the Stoics to concede that WE should do in other things? Especially when that, which was not clear to Panætius, is clearer than sunlight to the remainder of his sect."—**Cicero**, *De Divinatione*, **1**, 3.

omens. Yet Jewish writings before the Christian era never advocate it; a fact well deserving note, especially, at that stage of the world. A Being, whose communications had been exclusively addressed to man's moral nature, was not one upon whom questions such as were proposed to heathen deities could be obtruded. Perhaps this may explain why the argument which Cicero puts into his brother's mouth[67] must have failed of currency among reverential Jews. Yet there was another reason which may have reached a larger class. Divination was commonly attributed to the aid of spirits whom the Jews regarded as evil, and with whom they deemed themselves forbidden to hold intercourse.

After Cicero's time the Stoics, if we can judge from Seneca and Epictetus, modified or reversed their views of divination. Seneca seemingly ridicules it,[68] and Epictetus

---

[67] **Cicero** ascribes to his brother **Quintus** the following summary: "If there are gods, and if they do not make known to men future events beforehand, either they do not love men; or they are ignorant of the future; or they think it is of no importance to men to know the future; or they do not think that it comports with their dignity to pre-indicate the future to men; or not even the gods [though acquainted with the future] have means of comunicating future events."— Cicero, *De Divinat.* **1**, (38), 82. As none of these were admissible suppositions, Quintus believed in divination. In the course of his answer **Cicero** remarks: "They say that there is nothing impossible to divine power. I wish that it had made the Stoics wise, so that they should not, with superstitious solicitude and unhappiness, believe everything." Or perhaps the translation should read, "So that they should not with anxiety and unhappiness believe all things which are superstitious."— *De Divinat.* **2**, (41), 86. At a later date this language would, so far as it applied to omens and divination, have been deemed by patricians very heretical. The pitch which conservative condemnation of Cicero attained in the third century will be found in Ch. V. note 64.

[68] "We think: BECAUSE clouds have collided, therefore lightnings are emitted. They (the Tuscan soothsayers) think that the clouds collided for the express purpose of emitting lightnings. For when they refer all things to divine power, *ad deum*, they are evidently of opinion, that the significance is not because of the occurrences, but the occurrences take place because of their significance. These things are brought to

puts it not a little into the background.[69] Persons who differ from established views may in several ways be misled into unduly retaining popular phraseology.[70] The patrician representative of the Stoics betrays this tendency.[71]

---

pass by the same intelligence, whether what they signify be the object or [merely] the consequence of their occurrence. But how can they have significance unless they are sent by divine power *a deo?* Unless birds had been put in motion for this express purpose, that they should meet us, how could they have occasioned right-hand or left-hand auspices? Divine power, [the Tuscan] says, did move them, [I answer]: You treat divine nature as if it had too little to do and make it the minister of trifles, if it arranges dreams for one and entrails for another. Such things take place through divine aid, but the wings of birds are not guided by divine power nor are the entrails of animals formed under [the blow of] the axe."—**Seneca**, *Nat. Quæst.* **2**, 32, 2, 3. The concluding remark may have been based on Cicero's answer to his brother, *De Divinatione*, **2**, 16 (§§ 36, 37), that an ox could not have lived without a heart, nor could the heart have flown away at the moment of sacrifice. Seneca, however, had, in opposition to him the patrician party, who, with little or no belief themselves in divination, deemed a denial thereof a serious political heresy. Owing to this or some other reason, he mitigates his denial by stretching natural laws so as to cover the case, and affirms almost immediately afterwards: "There is no animal which, by its motion and meeting with us, does not foretell something."—*Nat. Quæst.* **2**, 32, 6.

[69] **Epictetus**, *Dissertat.* **2**, 7, 6. (Compare, however, *Dissertat.* **3**, 22, 53). *Encheiridion*, c. 39, otherwise numbered 32. These will be found in Schweighæuser's edit. **1**, pp. 201, 457; **4**, pp. 402, 403, ; and in Higginson's translation, pp. 112, 250, 388, 389.

[70] Sometimes the motive is to avoid odium; sometimes it is hesitation in selecting the most appropriate, or defensible, new terms for new views. Some have their desire of harmony satisfied, or at least gratified, if persons of discordant opinions can be brought to express them in the same form of words. Others please themselves with believing their own views more comprehensive in proportion to the number of incongruous systems whose phraseology they can adopt. Benevolent endowments conjoined to creeds were a motive unknown to heathens.

[71] "It is permissible to call by other names the author of our affairs. You may appropriately call him Jupiter. . . . *Stator*, who is not *Stator* because . . . after a vow to him, a flying army of Romans stood fast, but because through his good offices all things stand. . . . Our [sect] deem him father Bacchus and Hercules and Mercury: *father* Bacchus, because he

Cynics and Stoics were somewhat identified at Rome,[72] though not perhaps until after the expulsion, already mentioned, of Greek culture and Judaism from that city. A Cynic was, apparently, a morose or dogged Stoic, or one who prided himself on disregarding the comforts of life.[73] In fact any Stoics remote from Judaism and without, or with faint, belief in a moral ruler of the universe, or in a future life, must have been exposed to the risk of becoming grumblers. Their superior attention to moral questions would make them dissatisfied with the world around them, while there was nothing in their system which could counteract this dissatisfaction or make them cheerful, hopeful, and happy. The half-formed opinions and personal defects of this class must not, however, blind us to the earnest convictions and philanthropic zeal of truer Stoics. The importance which they attached to correct views of God can nowhere be found in heathen writers.[74]

The affiliation of Stoics with Jews implies, that the

---

is parent of all things; . . . Hercules, because his strength is insuperable and [because !] when he shall be wearied with labors performed, he will WITHDRAW INTO THE FIRE; Mercury, because reasoning and calculation and order and knowledge belong to him. . . . If you call him Nature, Fate, Fortune, all are names of the same God using his power variously." —**Seneca**, *De Benefic.* **4**, 7, 8, *Opp.* **2**, 473–475. The Hymn of Cleanthes in its first line addresses the deity as having many names, yet its author may have had in mind appellations very different from those of Seneca and not accommodated to heathen prejudices.

[72] See an instance in note 45. **Epictetus** identifies himself with the Stoics in his *Dissertat.* **2**, 19, 23, 24; **3**, 7, 17 (pp. 160, 211, Higginson's trans.); and with the Cynics, *Dissertat.* **3**, 22, 1–95 (pp. 243–258, Higginson's trans.).

[73] **Seneca** treats the Stoics as having control over, and the Cynics as having divested themselves of, their natural tendencies, *licet . . . hominis naturam cum Stoicis vincere cum Cynicis excedere.* Seneca, *De Brevitate Vitæ*, **15**, 5; *Opp. Philosoph.* **1**, 454.

[74] Cicero, at the conclusion of his *De Natura Deorum* (**3**, 94), represents the Stoic Balbus, after listening to Cotta's raillery, as exclaiming that they must discuss it again, that it was *pro aris et focis* for the most precious of human possessions.

mass of them, at least after party lines had been drawn, were not in political sympathy with patricians. Exceptions to this exist, as in the case of Helvidius Priscus and Marc Antonine. Politics in the former, probably, overlaid philosophy.[75] The latter, though well-intentioned, was so extravagantly fond of approbation as to become an easy tool of the aristocracy. A dignity or fortitude of character, attributed to Stoicism, may, especially at an early day, have drawn towards it some of the Roman aristocracy in ignorance, or in disregard of its alliance with Judaism.

In Hadrian's time Christianity had gained an influence in the heathen world which certainly equalled, and apparently much exceeded, that of Judaism. At this juncture, an embittered war[76] severed the hold of the latter upon heathens, and left Christianity to carry on the work which Judaism had begun. The generation which witnessed this crisis witnessed also the last days of Stoicism. Some already in its ranks retained their allegiance.[77] But no one born during or after the Jewish

[75] This Helvidius was, as nearly as possible, the personification of ultra-senatorial ideas. An emperor of the popular party was hateful to him (compare Ch. X. foot-note 37), but one who belonged to and favored his class received honor at his hands. After the death of Nero, the aristocracy called in Galba, whose journey to the city, according to Tacitus (*Hist.* **1**, 6) was bloody, and one of whose first acts was to murder several thousand unarmed soldiers (Tacitus, *Hist.* **1**, 6, 37) on the day of his entry. When Galba, not long afterwards, was killed, Helvidius Priscus asked for his body. (Plutarch, *Galba*, 28.) What little we know of Helvidius renders it less probable that this request was prompted by disinterested humanity than by party sympathy.

The reader may take interest in comparing his action with the following from two non-conservatives: "On the killing of Galba, some one remarked to [Musonius] Rufus, 'Now the world is governed by Providence.' His reply was, 'Did I ever casually argue from Galba that the world was governed by Providence?'" — **Epictetus, 3**, 15, 14. In Higginson's translation it stands at the close of Ch. 17. This Musonius is the Stoic mentioned in note 45.

[76] See Ch. X. § VI. and Ch. XI.

[77] Arrian was thirty years old when the war broke out, and Marc Antonine, though but a boy, had made profession of Stoicism.

war under Hadrian is known to history as a Stoic. Had the sect been exclusively of heathen origin this would be unaccountable. If it originated in monotheistic influence, one explanation, and only one, seems tenable. A class of heathens who admired, or were attracted towards, the teachings of Judaism, had, by some of its customs, or by prejudice of race, been kept outside of its ranks. Monotheism, and a God interested in man's moral education, were now taught without these customs and without barrier of race. Thenceforward this class became Christians.

CHAPTER IV.

JEWISH DIVISION INTO WEEKS.

§ 1. *Adopted by Heathens.*

THE preceding chapter gave details of Jewish influence on a body of thoughtful moralists. The present one implies equal or stronger influence on the popular mind. The Jews divided time into weeks, a division unknown to Greeks and Romans before contact with them.[1] Its universal adoption by society, while the government and ruling classes were hostile to Judaism, cannot be accounted for by its convenience,[2] nor in any way, save by assuming a Jewish influence on the generality of heathens so powerful as to overbear governmental and patrician opposition.

---

[1] See Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* pp. 222–233, on the Greek and Roman Calendar. Any division into weeks is there ignored.

[2] Seven days constitute the nearest approximation to one quarter of a lunar month. The number is not an exact divisor either of a month or year, and it admits no subdivision. In Christian communities time is much less calculated for secular purposes by weeks than by months and days.

Already, thirty or forty years before the Christian era, Horace represents a friend as, jocosely or seriously, declining attention to business on the thirtieth sabbath, with the remark, "I AM ONE OF THE MANY." [3]

About the Christian era a heathen teacher in Rhodes, mentioned by Suetonius,[4] taught on every seventh day, which implies that the division into weeks was already recognized, to at least a moderate extent, by the community around him.

Near the middle of the first century, Seneca, after speaking of the sabbath, represents Jewish usages as having pervaded all nations, the conquered as having given law to the conquerors, — a noteworthy testimony from one who had no sympathy with the usages. In another passage he condemns the custom of lighting candles or lamps on the sabbath.[5]

At the close of the first century Josephus appeals to heathen cognizance of the extent to which observance of the seventh day and of other Jewish customs had spread.[6] Whatever may have been the character of

---

[3] See fuller quotation in Ch. VII. note 49.

[4] "Diogenes, the grammarian, who used to hold public disquisitions at Rhodes every sabbath-day, once refused him [Tiberius] admittance upon his coming to hear him out of course, and sent him a message by a servant, postponing his admission until the next seventh day." — **Suetonius**, *Tiberius*, 32, Bohn's trans.

[5] Seneca, *Against Superstitions* (quoted by Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, **6**, 11); also *Epistle* **95**, 47. See both passages quoted more fully in Ch. VIII. note 132.

[6] "Has not marked imitation of our practical monotheism [in the sense of monotheistic practices] found place in far-off multitudes? There is no city whatever of the Greeks nor a barbarian one, there is not one nation, where the custom has not spread of [observing] the seventh day, on which we rest. Also our fasts, our burning of lamps and many of our prohibited meats, are borne in mind. They TRY also to imitate our mutual good-will, our alms-giving of our goods, our industry in MECHANICAL ARTS, and our endurance in suffering for our laws." — **Josephus**, *Against Apion*, **2**, 39 (*al.* 40). Compare Juvenal, cited in Ch. X. note 118. On the use of "practical monotheism" to designate or include ceremonial observances, see in the Appendix, under Note B, § 1, the last paragraph of sub-section 4.

Josephus, his appeal would have been inexplicable, unless the division into weeks had already been widely adopted by heathens.

§ II. *Numbering and Nomenclature of the Days.*

A distinct question from the division into weeks is that of nomenclature for the individual days. The Jews used none.[7] They designated the first and last days of the week as the "First" day, the "Seventh" day. How they designated the intermediate ones is less evident,—perhaps by numbering forward or backward from the seventh. In the beginning of the third century, a custom had become general among heathens of naming the seven days after the sun, moon, and five then known planets.[8] Fifty years earlier Justin Martyr, a Gentile Christian, subsequently to the Jewish rebellion under Hadrian, in a work addressed to heathens, speaks of Sunday and Saturday, but ignores or avoids any name for Friday.[9] Tertullian also, in works addressed to

---

[7] Their term sabbath for the seventh day is scarcely an exception.

[8] "The connecting of the days with the seven stars called planets [the sun, moon, and five then known planets] originated with the Egyptians, and exists among all men, having, as we may say, commenced not very long ago. The ancient Greeks, as I think, knew nothing of it. But since it is now a fixed custom both among other people and among the Romans themselves, and is to these latter in some sense a NATIONAL CUSTOM, I wish to discourse a little concerning it." —**Dio Cass. 37,** 18; Vol. **1,** 302. Dio treats this subject in connection with the Jewish matters in the time of Pompey, B. C. 63. It was, therefore, in his mind, associated with the Jews. By Egyptians, he must have meant merely residents of Egypt, — Greek residents, no doubt, since the names of the planets are borrowed from those of Greek, not of Egyptian, deities.

[9] "On the day CALLED 'of the Sun' all . . . come together. . . . On the day of the Sun we all come together since it is the 'First day' on which God, after dispelling darkness and chaos, formed the world, and on the same day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. For they crucified him on THE DAY BEFORE THE DAY OF SATURN; and on the day after the day of Saturn, that is, on the day of the Sun, . . . he taught these things." —**Justin Martyr,** *Apol.* **1,** 67.

heathens, uses the terms day of the Sun and day of Saturn.[10] The surmise would be plausible, that during the wide-spread anti-Jewish feeling in and after the latter years of Hadrian, an effort had been made to identify the weekly division of time with heathenism, or at least to relieve it somewhat from Jewish associations, by a nomenclature borrowed from planets named after heathen deities. The adoption of this nomenclature at Rome — by the ruling class doubtless — as a NATIONAL CUSTOM, notwithstanding its origin among Greeks, strongly favors the above surmise.

In Asia the rebellion under Hadrian did not, to the same extent as in Europe, abolish respect for Jewish institutions. In North Africa the remains of this respect, even when vehemently shaken off by some Christians, are visible among heathens.[11]

Were we to stop here, the nomenclature of days would seem to have originated exclusively among heathens, but the name of Saturn was connected with the seventh day at least one hundred and fifty or two hundred years before the rebellion under Hadrian. Tibullus, a cotemporary of Virgil, uses the phrase *day of Saturn*,[12] and the prominence given to Saturn in the Erythræan verses, B. C. 76, renders probable that already at that date the name of this planet was connected with the seventh day.[13]

---

[10] Tertul. *Apol.* c. 16, and *Ad Nat.* **1**, 13.

[11] **Tertullian** speaks of persons, heathens doubtless, who "devote the Day of Saturn to ease and eating; living outside of Jewish custom, which they ignore."—*Apol.* c. 16. Elsewhere (*Ad Nat.* **1**, 13) he mentions heathens who made the same use of Sunday.

[12] Tibullus, *Eleg.* **1**, 3, 18.

[13] On the above supposition the writer of the Erythræan verses would have had a motive for inventing the idea that Saturn was the first king of Italy, namely, that its inhabitants, for whom he was writing, might, as advocates of Ancient Custom, give special attention to the day of their first king. Compare Appendix, Note A, foot-note 49. Were there evidence that Saturn had been regarded earlier than B. C. 76 as the first king of Italy, then it would on the other hand become a fair question whether the Erythræan writer had not invented the term *Day of Saturn*, since our first mention of it comes from Italy.

Possibly some Jew, or school of Jews, may, at a yet earlier date, have endeavored to create reverence among Heathens for the sabbath by associating it with that planet, which moved (according to the Alexandrine system) in the HIGHEST or SEVENTH heaven ;[14] the heaven, according at least to some Alexandrine Jews, in which dwelt the Supreme Being.

In a Jewish mind, the first day of the week could readily be associated with the sun by the statement, **Genesis, 1,** 3, "God said, Let there be light, and there was light."

§ III. *Lord's Day.*

The substitution by some Christians, about A. D. 52 or 53, of the first for the seventh day as one of religious gathering, will be considered in Ch. VIII. § V.

Christians may in the first century have called the first day of the week the LORD'S DAY ; but the earliest certain evidence of such use is in the latter part of the second century.[15] Jewish habits of merely numbering the days retained, until at least the fourth century, such prominence as to be recognized in imperial edicts.[16]

---

[14] **Tacitus,** after mentioning one reason why Jews rested on the seventh day, adds : "Others [allege] that honor to have been intended for Saturn . . . because among the seven stars [sun, moon, and five planets] by which mortals are governed, the star of Saturn moves in the highest orbit." — Tacitus, *Hist.* **5,** 4.

[15] See Dionysius of Corinth (quoted by Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* **4,** 23), and yet later, Tertullian, *De Idol.* c. 14 ; *De Corona Mil.* c. 3 ; *De Orat.* c. 18.

Luke and Paul retain (Acts, **20,** 7; 1 Cor. **16,** 2) the Jewish phraseology. The Apocalypse (**1,** 10) in all probability uses κυριακή, Day of the Lord, for the day of his second coming. The same use by Melito (Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* **4,** 26) is also probable. Compare Ch. IX. note 20. In the middle of the second century a Christian epithet for the first day of the week, at least among semi-Jewish Christians, was "the Eighth day." See Epistle of Barnabas, c. 15 ; Justin Martyr, *Dial.* cc. 24, 41.

[16] **Suicer** in his *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus,* **2,** 183, col. 2 (2d. edit.), under the article κυριακή, quotes the statement of Nicephorus (Book **7,** 46), "The day which Jews called 'the first' and which Greeks [heathens ?] affixed to the sun, he [Constantine] NAMED [legally ?] the Lord's day." Compare other quotations on the same page.

CHAPTER V.

AFFILIATED QUESTIONS.

§ 1. *Public Games.*

In times of political and theological strife questions not necessarily connected with either are apt to become involved and occupy prominent places. Some such, in the conflict at Rome, are important enough to claim distinct headings.

First on the list stand the public games, which effected more than any other institution towards demoralizing and brutalizing the Roman mind. The senatorial faction at Rome identified itself with these brutalities. Whenever, during the period discussed in these pages, aristocracy and heathenism were dominant, the games became outrages on humanity. When the popular and monotheistic party had ascendency, the taking of life in them was usually prohibited, even if the games were not abolished. Aristocratic leanings in this respect can be explained partly by the pretext which it afforded individuals for filling their pockets at expense of the provinces, and partly by a fear of Judaism and a consequent desire to oppose all its teachings. Judaism repudiated barbarous amusements.[1] Opposition to Judaism made the patrician party advocate them. There is no reason why the patrician, rather than the popular, party should have upheld brutality in the games, save the different relation in which it stood to monotheism.

Although party lines on this subject may not have been stringently drawn before the time of Augustus, yet their respective leanings can be discerned earlier. When the patrician plunderer Flaccus was succeeded, in B. C. 61, as governor over a part of Asia Minor by Quintus Cicero, a member of the popular party, public games were at once

---

[1] See Josephus, *Antiq.* **15**, 8, 1, quoted in Ch. II. note 26.

abolished.[2] Julius Cæsar, the popular leader, was not overly tender of human life, but it deserves note perhaps that he ordinarily manifested but little interest in these games.[3]

During the reign of Augustus rival influences conflicted violently in the community. Monotheism, moral reform, and popular rights were gradually gaining strength. Patrician privileges and ancient usages, by a resort to fraud and violence, obtained, in B. C. 17, exclusive control of the Senate. Augustus, for no small portion of his reign, became an instrument of reactionaries, and therefore public games were in vogue.[4] If the date of his differ-

---

[2] **Cicero** writes to his brother Quintus: "How great a benefit have you conferred by freeing Asia, in spite of our intense grudge, from the unjust and onerous Ædilitian tribute [for public games], since if one of the nobility openly complains that by your edict, 'NO MONEY SHALL BE APPROPRIATED TO GAMES,' you have deprived him of two hundred thousand sesterces, what an amount would be paid if, as had become customary, exactions should be made in the name of all who exhibit games at Rome!" — **Cicero**, *Epist. ad Fratrem*, **1**, 1; Vol. **3**, 541.

Cicero in his *Laws* seems to fluctuate between forbidding personal conflicts in the public games (*De Leg.* **2**, 9) and forbidding only such (*De Leg.* **2**, 15) as imperilled life. His views on this point may have been among the heresies for which, at a later date, the heathen party wished to burn his writings.

[3] Cæsar conformed to custom by exhibiting games (Sueton. *Cæsar*, c. 39) in which, on the occasion, at least, of his triumph, life must have been imperilled if not lost. He himself usually took so little interest in them as to attend to ordinary business during their performance (Sueton. *August.* c. 45), incurring no little blame thereby. Yet his triumphal games vied with patricianism in expense and, if the account by Dio Cassius (**43**, 23, 24) be correct, in murderousness. If so, it is to be hoped that the censure, said to have been bestowed on him, may have come from enlightened men of his own party, and may have aided in preventing a repetition of such folly and barbarity. The real, or sham, battle on that occasion was performed on each side by five hundred foot, twenty elephants, and thirty horse. Sueton. *Cæsar*, c. 39.

[4] "In the number, variety, and magnificence of his public spectacles he surpassed all former example. Four-and-twenty times, he says, he treated the people with games upon his own account, and three-and-

ent ordinances concerning them could be determined,[5] a

twenty times for such magistrates as were either absent or not able to afford the expense. The performances took place sometimes in the different streets of the city, and upon several stages, by players in all languages. The same he did not only in the forum and amphitheatre, but in the circus likewise, and in the septa; and sometimes he exhibited only the hunting of wild beasts. He entertained the people with wrestlers in the Campus Martius, where wooden seats were erected for the purpose; and also with a naval fight, for which he excavated the ground near the Tiber, where there is now the grove of the Cæsars. During these two entertainments he stationed guards in the city lest, by robbers taking advantage of the small number of people left at home, it might be exposed to depredations. In the circus he exhibited chariot and foot races, and combats with wild beasts, in which the performers were often youths of the highest rank. His favorite spectacle was the Trojan game, acted by a select number of boys, in parties differing in age and station; thinking that it was a practice both excellent in itself, and SANCTIONED BY ANCIENT USAGE, that the spirit of the young nobles should be displayed in such exercises. Caius Nonius Asprenus, who was lamed by a fall in this diversion, he presented with a gold collar, and allowed him and his posterity to bear the surname of Torquati. But soon afterwards he gave up the exhibition of this game, in consequence of a severe and bitter speech made in the Senate by Asinius Pollio, the orator, in which he complained bitterly of the misfortune of Æserninus, his grandson, who likewise broke his leg in the same diversion." — **Sueton.** *August.* c. 43, Bohn's trans. "He took particular pleasure in witnessing pugilistic contests, especially those of the Latins, not only between combatants who had been trained scientifically, whom he used often to match with the Greek champions, but even between mobs of the lower classes fighting in the streets, and tilting at random without any knowledge of the art. In short, he honored with his patronage all sorts of people who contributed in any way to the success of the public entertainments. He not only maintained, but enlarged, the privileges of the wrestlers." — **Sueton.** *August.* c. 45, Bohn's trans. Asinius Pollio, mentioned in the first of the foregoing extracts, was the host of Herod's two sons (Josephus, *Antiq.* **15**, 10, 1), and the person to whom Virgil addressed his partly Messianic eclogue. His relations to the anti-senatorial party were such, that he refused to accompany Augustus in the war against Antony. He founded the earliest public library at Rome, and believed, apparently, in a culture different from that of public games. The accident to his grandson was the occasion, more probably than the motive, for his utterance.

[5] "He prohibited combats of gladiators where no quarter was given.

more reliable opinion might be formed as to whether the humaner ones were occasioned by influence of his step-son Tiberius, which weighed much with him during his later years, or whether public opinion, aiding his better impulses, had elicited them.

Tiberius believed in human rights and human improvement, not in patrician privileges. From him brutalizing amusements found no favor.[6]

He deprived the magistrates of the power of correcting the stage-players, which by an ancient law was allowed them at all times and in all places; restricting their jurisdiction entirely to the time of performance and misdemeanors in the theatres. He would, however, admit of no abatement, and exacted with the utmost rigor the greatest exertions of the wrestlers and gladiators in their several encounters." — **Sueton.** *August.* c. 45, Bohn's trans.

[6] Touching theatrical performances in A. D. 14, when Tiberius had just come to the throne, **Tacitus** says: "Augustus . . . had no distaste for such pursuits, and deemed it courteous (or perhaps deemed it 'a Roman's duty' *civile*) to mingle in pleasures of the common people. The habits of Tiberius followed a different path; but he did not, as yet, dare to turn towards more earnest pursuits a people who had been indulged during so many years." — Tacitus, *An.* **1**, 54. In the year A. D. 15 "certain knights being desirous of fighting a duel in the combats which Drusus gave in behalf of himself and Germanicus, (Tiberius) did not witness the fight, and when one was killed, he forbade the other any further fighting with weapons." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 14. "Drusus presided in the gladiatorial contests which he gave in his own name and and in that of his brother Germanicus, manifesting too much satisfaction in bloody fights, though between persons of the lower classes, for which . . . his father [Tiberius] is said to have reproved him. Why [Tiberius] himself abstained from the show is variously interpreted; . . . some attributed it to distaste for pleasure, *tristiti a ingenii*, and fear of comparison, because Augustus liked to associate in such places." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **1**, 76. No other instance of such a tendency in Drusus is mentioned by any one. In the year A. D. 27 "a certain Atilius, of the freedman class, having begun an amphitheatre at Fidenæ, wherein to exhibit a gladiatorial show, . . . those who were greedy of such things flocked thither, because debarred from [such] amusements [at Rome] under the reign of Tiberius." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **4,** 62. Tiberius "having given his opinion that permission should be granted the Trebians for transferring, towards the construction of a road, money which had been left by will for a new theatre,

Caligula, though his father and subsequently his mother had been leaders of the patrician party, and though he may for a time have hoped to live in peace with it, did not share its views. His education by Tiberius had rendered brutal amusements repugnant to him, and when an occasion called for it he uttered this repugnance in unmistakable terms.[7]

With the accession of Claudius, patricianism obtained complete control. Murder in the public games became a daily amusement;[8] and Seneca, who expressed himself strongly on the subject,[9] was banished. He may, in

---

could not obtain the permission. The vote happened to be taken by a division. He went to the side of the minority, and no one followed him." — **Sueton.** *Tiber.* c. 31.

[7] When five men were killed in the public games, Caligula, "in a published edict, deplored the slaughter, and execrated those who had endured to look at it." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* c. 30.

[8] Claudius "instituted constantly single fights; for he took such pleasure in them as to have a fault in this direction. Very few beasts were destroyed, but many men, some being killed in fighting against each other, and some by wild beasts. He had a terrible dislike for the slaves and freedmen, who under Tiberius and Caligula had plotted against their masters, as also for such as had carelessly calumniated, or had borne false witness against any. He punished most of them in the above manner, and others in some different way. He also delivered many to their masters for punishment. The number of those who died in public was so great, that the statue of Augustus, there located, was moved elsewhere, that it might neither be regarded as constantly in the sight of murder nor [have to] be constantly veiled." — **Dio Cass. 60,** 13.

The last sentence is a fair illustration of heathen views. Even a murderer who fled to a shrine could not, without insult to the god, be either punished there or removed, but a covering to his eyes prevented his knowledge of what was transpiring.

Claudius "took chief pleasure in witnessing those who were cut down at the middle of the performance, about dinner-time; although he had a lion killed which had been taught (?) to EAT human beings, and which, on that account, was a special favorite with the multitude,— on the ground that it was not fitting for Romans to look upon such a spectacle." — **Dio Cass. 60,** 13.

[9] "Nothing is so injurious to good morals as to take a seat in one of

other respects than as regarded his views of such amusement, have been deemed an unfaithful patrician.[10]

Single combats were, in the beginning of this reign, a favorite method of murdering slaves who had willingly, or by compulsion, testified against their masters. The aristocracy had, during their revolt under Tiberius, committed many murders, and had, during Caligula's time, planned, if not perpetrated, others. Whoever brought action against them could take the evidence of their slaves by torture. The Roman law subjected these unfortunates to torture for the purpose of eliciting truth;

---

our public exhibitions; for at such times vices, because mingled with amusement, creep in readily. . . . By chance, I happened into the mid-day exhibition, expecting plays and witticisms, and some relaxation wherewith men might rest from the sight of human gore. On the contrary, the previous fighting was merciful [in comparison]. Now, trifles laid aside, we have the merest homicides. The men have no protection; their whole bodies are exposed; no blow is in vain. Most persons prefer this to the ordinary, or extraordinary, matches, *ordinariis paribus et postulatitiis*. . . . The end of the fighters is death. Sword and fire are used [to drive combatants on]. These things continue till the arena be empty. But some one [you say] has committed robbery. What then? He has deserved to be hung. He has [you say] killed a man. The murderer deserves this suffering. But what have you deserved, miserable man, that you should [have to] look on? Kill, strike, burn [him]. Why is he so timid to rush against the sword? Why so void of audacity to kill? Why so unwilling to die? By blows they are driven against wounds, that they may receive mutual [sword] cuts in their naked and opposed bodies. The EXHIBITION is intermitted. In the mean time, men are executed lest nothing should be going on. . . . What do you believe that the result will be to the morals against which a public attack is [thus] made? You must [if present] imitate or hate [what is going on]. Either is to be avoided; that you may neither be rendered like to evil men because of their number, nor an enemy to the many because they are unlike you. Recede into yourself as much as you can. Associate with those who will improve you. Admit [to your society] those whom you can improve." — **Seneca**, *Epist.* **7**, 2–7. The exposure to wild beasts, Seneca says (*Epist.* **7**, 3) took place in the forenoon.

[10] The assigned cause for Seneca's banishment (Dio Cass. **60**, 8) is not credible.

and now the masters, having obtained ascendency, forced such as had told the truth to murder each other in sight, and for the gratification, of those against whom, or against whose interests, they had testified. Had the spectators been fiends, the congruity between them and the spectacle would have been perfect.

In the year 44 the siege and capture of a town was represented in the Campus Martius,[11] and in A. D. 52, when the anti-Jewish movement culminated, nineteen thousand men were surrounded by military forces and compelled for hours, in a naval engagement, to maim and kill each other.[12] The apologists of patricianism assert

---

[11] Claudius "exhibited in the Campus Martius a siege and capture of a town to represent warlike doings and the surrender of the British kings." — **Sueton.** *Claud.* c. 21. Compare Dio Cass. **60**, 23.

[12] "About the same time, a passage having been cut through the mountain between the Lake Fucinus and the river Liris, that a greater number of persons might be induced to come and see the magnificence of the work, a sea-fight was got up on the lake itself, in the same manner as Augustus before exhibited one upon an artificial pool on this side the Tiber, but with light ships and fewer men. Claudius equipped galleys of three and four banks of oars, and manned them with nineteen thousand mariners, surrounding the space with a line of rafts, to limit the means of escape, but giving room enough, in its circuit, to ply the oars, for the pilots to exert their skill, for the ships to be brought to bear down upon each other, and for all the usual operations in a sea-fight. Upon the rafts, parties of the pretorian guards, foot and horse, were stationed, with bulwarks before them, from which catapults and balistas might be worked; the rest of the lake was occupied by marine forces, stationed on decked ships. The shores, the adjacent hills, and the tops of the mountains were crowded with a countless multitude, many from the neighboring towns, others from Rome itself; impelled either by desire to witness the spectacle, or IN COMPLIMENT TO THE PRINCE, and exhibited the appearance of a vast theatre. The Emperor presided, in a superb coat of mail, and, not far from him, Agrippina, in a mantle of cloth of gold. The battle, though between malefactors, was fought with the spirit of brave men; and, after a great effusion of blood, they were excused from pursuing the carnage to extremity.

"When the spectacle was concluded, the channel through which the water passed off was exhibited to view, when the negligence of the work-

these men to have been all malefactors, — a statement implying that the mass of evil-doers understood marine warfare. It is unworthy of credence. The alleged object for this fight — namely, to increase appreciation of an engineering work by the multitudes who should be brought together — is a transparent absurdity. Party feeling and self-glorification planned it. The combatants must have been largely sailors and soldiers from the popular party. Public men who absented themselves would undoubtedly have incurred the charge of disloyalty to those in power. The intended victims hoped, even at the last moment, that such butchery would not be persisted in, and the Emperor had his own difficulties to make them fight.[13] Some smaller exhibitions are omitted.[14]

With the accession of Nero, a reaction took place against patricianism. This may have commenced earlier,[15] but it now had power to control the administra-

---

men became manifest, as the work was not carried to the depth of the bottom or centre of the lake. The excavations were, therefore, after some time, extended to a greater depth ; and, to draw the multitude once more together, a show of gladiators was exhibited upon bridges laid over it, in order to display a fight of infantry. Moreover, an erection for the purpose of a banquet, at the embouchure of the lake, occasioned great alarm to the whole assembly, for the force of the water rushing out, carried away whatever was near it, shook and sundered what was more distant, or terrified the guests with the crash and noise. At the same time, Agrippina, converting the Emperor's alarm to her purposes, charged Narcissus, the director of the work, with avarice and robbery ; nor did Narcissus suppress his indignation, but charged Agrippina with 'the overbearing spirit of her sex, and with extravagant ambition.'" — **Tacitus**, *An.* **12**, 56, 57, Bohn's trans. The squabble at the close fairly illustrates the kind of feeling which such entertainments were calculated to promote.

[13] Sueton. *Claud.* 21.

[14] See Dio Cass. **60**, 7, 13, 23 ; Tac. *An.* **11**, 11 ; Sueton. *Claud.* c. 21.

[15] The recall of Seneca in A. D. 49 may have been owing to an increase of popular indignation at his exile. Tacitus attributes it (*An.* **12**, 8), very improbably, to the favor of Agrippina, who seems constantly to have been his opponent. Tacitus may have failed to see, or recciled

tion. The community had probably become disgusted with shows and butcheries instead of improvements. Seneca, who had spent most of the preceding reign in exile, was, with Burrhus, placed in charge. Some time may have elapsed before the new administration was able to commence reforms, but when, in A. D. 57, a new amphitheatre had been finished, orders were given that none, not even condemned criminals, should be killed in the gladiatorial contests.[16] Magistrates in charge of provinces were forbidden to exhibit fights of gladiators or of wild beasts.[17] The reason assigned for this by Tacitus is true, but is only a part of the truth. Provincial magistrates, in the preceding reign, had fleeced the people, and then wished the credit of generosity because of exhibitions which were not only demoralizing, but pecuniarily onerous to those whom they governed. Moral sense and monotheistic teaching co-operated with pecuniary interests in the defeat of patricianism. The contest was a hard one. The patricians gained a point on the subject of slavery, as will hereafter appear. The new administration may have confined itself to remedying the most glaring evils, and may have allowed less objectionable substitutes. In A. D. 55 a bull-fight, resembling modern Spanish ones, took place.[18]

Nero, though not without good points, had defects of character which must have seriously interfered with most reforms. The Jewish rebellion, of which the first mut-

---

from saying, that the patricians had cowered before popular and monotheistic feeling.

[16] Tacitus gives the date in his *Annals*, **13**, 31; and Suetonius the facts in his life of *Nero*, c. 12.

[17] "The Emperor, too, issued an edict, 'that no procurator, nor any other magistrate, who had obtained any province, should exhibit a spectacle of gladiators or of wild beasts, or any other popular entertainment whatsoever'; for, heretofore, they had by such acts of munificence no less oppressed those under their jurisdiction, than by extortion, warding off the blame of their guilty excesses by the arts of popularity." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **13**, 31, Bohn's trans.

[18] "Men killed bulls, chasing them on horseback." — **Dio Cass. 61**, 9.

terings were heard in A. D. 64, shortly after the burning of Rome, gave, doubtless, an advantage to patrician reactionaries.

Galba, Otho, and Vitellius were, during more than a year, rival contestants for the throne, and were succeeded by Vespasian, who was of the anti-patrician party. It is, therefore, no matter of surprise to find all mention of public games in his reign omitted by Suetonius, and but a line concerning them in Dio. "Vespasian had beasts killed in the theatres, but took no great pleasure in human duels." [19]

The complying disposition of Titus subjected him, in more respects than one, to the patricians. In his two years' reign human duels were applauded by a prince, though not, perhaps, very heartily.[20]

Domitian, though attentive to the administration of justice, and favoring some anti-patrician reforms, cannot have had special scruples about public games.[21] Had his history been written by friends, instead of by enemies, we could determine his views better.

Nerva, his successor, was identified with the popular and monotheistic party. He abolished inhuman amusements.[22]

---

[19] **Dio Cass. 66,** 15.

[20] "Having dedicated his amphitheatre, and built some warm baths close by it with great expedition, he entertained the people with most magnificent spectacles. He likewise exhibited a naval fight in the old Naumachia, besides a combat of gladiators; and in one day brought into the theatre five thousand wild beasts of all kinds." — **Sueton.** *Titus*, c. 7, Bohn's trans. "He treated the people on all occasions with so much courtesy, that, on his presenting them with a show of gladiators, he declared, 'He should manage it, not according to his own fancy, but that of the spectators,' and did accordingly. He denied them nothing, and very frankly encouraged them to ask what they pleased. Espousing the cause of the Thracian party among the gladiators, he frequently joined in the popular demonstrations in their favor, but without compromising his dignity or doing injustice."— **Sueton.** *Titus*, c. 8, Bohn's trans. "At the close of the public spectacles he wept bitterly in the presence of the people." — **Sueton.** *Titus*, c. 10, Bohn's trans.

[21] See Sueton. *Domit.* 4.

[22] In Sturz's **Dio Cassius,** Vol. **6,** p. 599, note 13, appended to Book

Trajan, who followed him, was a representative of patrician interests. Under him, games again equalled or exceeded in atrocity those under Claudius.[23]

Hadrian can scarcely be classified with either party. Gladiatorial contests were not prominent nor prohibited in his reign.[24]

Antoninus Pius was a thoughtfully conscientious man, averse to more than one patrician hobby, if we can judge from a brief historical sketch by Capitolinus. His biographer mentions shows of rare wild beasts,[25] but says nothing of killing men for amusement, and a quoted saying of his renders improbable that he permitted it.[26]

Marc Antonine had a Stoic education and patrician surroundings. He compromised his conscience by permitting some cruelties alien to his feelings,[27] but he furnished gladiators with bloodless weapons for their contests when he was present.[28]

In the days of Augustus, Claudius, Trajan, and Marc Antonine, the party in power, the party with which the prince usually co-operated, were obviously advocates of these demoralizing shows. That party had created a

---

68, are the following extracts: "By this Emperor (Nerva) the single fights and shows of them were forbidden."— **Zonaras**, p. 538, D. "During this time gladiators were prohibited and [also] shows of them, and in their place hunts as a show were invented." — **Chronicon Paschale**, under A. D. 97. According to **Dio Cassius, 68**, 2, Nerva "abolished many sacrifices, many Circensian games, and SOME OTHER public spectacles, doing away expenses so far as possible."

[23] See in note 58 of Ch. X. details from Dio Cassius, **68**, 15.

[24] Hadrian "exhibited a gladiatorial contest through six successive days. . . . He rejected Circensian games voted to him, except those for his birthday." — **Spartianus**, *Adrian.* 7, 8.

[25] Capitolinus, *Antonin. Pius*, c. 9; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 36.

[26] "He said: He would rather save one citizen than kill a thousand enemies." — **Capitolinus**, *Antonin. Pius*, c. 9; *Script. Hist. Aug.* p. 35.

[27] See extract from Dio Cass. **71**, 29, in note 9 of Ch. XII.

[28] "Marcus took so little pleasure in killings, that he would [only] be present at the contests of gladiators in Rome [when] fighting as did athletes without peril [of life], for he never gave any of them sharp weapons." — **Dio Cass. 71**, 29.

class feeling in favor of them which its individual members did not openly and decidedly dare to oppose, though some of them in private uttered their disapprobation.[29] The censure of public games by Tacitus, even if indirect, implies that a portion of patricians were dissatisfied with them. He would otherwise have been obsequiously silent. That a mob favored customary amusements is a matter of course.

§ II. *War.*

A study of the two centuries included in this work shows that foreign wars were far more common under patrician rule than during the reigns of non-patrician or anti-patrician princes. The reigns of Augustus, Claudius, Trajan, and Marc Antonine, especially that of Trajan, were soiled in this way. The reign of Tiberius was remarkably peaceful. Caligula, Nero, Vespasian, and other Emperors, under whom the aristocracy failed of control, were, to a fair degree, free from external war. This was due to two causes. The moral objections to war had a more recognized standing in the party which was allied with monotheism,[30] and this same party, the popular one,

---

[29] See letter of Pliny, Jun., in Ch. X. note 59.

[30] "We restrain homicides and individual murder. What [do we concerning] wars and the glorious wickedness of slaughtered nations? . . . The very things for which, if men committed them as individuals, they would be capitally punished, we praise because they performed them *paludati* in a general's uniform [or, more literally, in a general's cloak]." — **Seneca,** *Epist.* **95,** 31; *Opp. Philos.* **4,** 115. "Listen to another question. How shall we deal with men? What shall we do, what precepts shall we give, that we may spare human blood? How important is it not to injure him whom you ought to benefit! It deserves great praise if a man be gentle towards men. Shall we command, that man extend his hand to the shipwrecked, point the way to the erring, share his bread with the hungry? How long should I need for the enumeration of all things which are to be done and avoided? Yet I can deliver him in brief this formula of human duty. 'The universe which you see, embracing things divine and human, is a unit. We are members of one great body. Nature made us relatives.'" — **Seneca,** *Epist.* **95,** 51, 52; *Opp.* **4,** 123. On sharing bread with the hungry, compare Job, **22,** 7; Prov. **25,**

bore, in case of war, the most of its burdens, while its emoluments inured to the privileged classes.[31] It may have been partly on this account that when effort was made to substitute a senatorial for a non-senatorial prince, the common soldiers (see § IX.) were found, or deemed to be, obstacles in the way.

Cicero in his *De Republica*, written in defence of patrician views, makes the elder Scipio appear in a dream to his grandson and assure him that there was in heaven a place allotted to such as augmented the national territory.[32]

§ III. *Annexation and Disintegration.*

In order to understand the senatorial position on conversion of dependent or independent kingdoms into Roman provinces, and reconverting the same into dependent kingdoms, we must study a division of provinces made in the time of Augustus between the Emperor and Senate.[33] The latter wished increase of its own power and emoluments rather than of the Emperor's. Consequently it favored annexation when hoping an increase of its own domain,[34] and favored disintegration when anxious to de-

---

21; Is. **58**, 7 and 10; Ezek. **18**, 7 and 16. On the membership of one body, compare 1 Cor. **12**, 12, 20, 27 (a new application, perhaps, of Jewish teaching), and an extract from Sandars, hereafter to be given in Ch. VII. note 89.

[31] At the death of Augustus common soldiers had been kept in service (Tacitus, *An.* **1**, 35) for thirty years. This was soon mitigated when Tiberius became Emperor. The privileged classes, from whom the officers were chiefly taken, had, on the other hand, many ways of filling their pockets by contracts or robbery during war time. The absence of newspapers rendered exposure of fraud more difficult.

[32] Cicero, *De Repub.* **6**, 7; *Opp. Philos.* **5**, 375 (Greek text, c. 3; *Opp. Philos.* **5**, 408.) Compare extract in Ch. VII. note 23.

[33] Dio Cassius (**53**, 12) enumerates the provinces which in B. C. 27 were under senatorial and those which were under imperial control.

[34] A somewhat similar condition of things existed for a time in our own country. The slaveholders at the South wished annexation of territory to their own section, that their political power might be increased. They manifested no such desire to increase the area of the Northern non-slaveholding States.

tract from that of the Emperor in behalf of its own coadjutors.[35] The instances of voluntary annexation, or of unsuccessful requests for it by communities, seem always to have affected the imperial, not the senatorial, portion of Rome's domain.[36] No community was anxious to come under rule of the Senate.

The alleged appointment of Herod Agrippa, *Senior*, as king in the first or second year of Caligula is, equally with the alleged cotemporary appointment of Antiochus, open to suspicion of being a political falsehood of later date. The subsequent presence of Herod Agrippa at Rome, and his evident favor and connection with the senatorial murderers of Caligula, imply that he did not expect advancement from Caligula, but did expect it from the Senate. In this he was not disappointed. When Claudius, an imbecile, attained the throne and became a senatorial tool, Herod had a kingdom given him equalling in dimensions that of Herod the Great; and, perhaps to prevent subsequent curtailment or withdrawal of it, Claudius must have been induced to make a public compact with Herod in the Roman forum.

The appointment of an alabarch or ethnarch over the

---

[35] The domain granted to successive Jewish kings and ethnarchs, and to Antiochus of Commagene, could detract only from imperial, not from senatorial, provinces.

[36] On the death of Herod, surnamed the Great, his unfortunate subjects earnestly, but unsuccessfully, petitioned (Josephus, *Antiq.* **17**, 11, 1, 2) for annexation to the imperial province of Syria. Commagene wished and received in A. D. 17 the privilege of becoming an imperial province under Tiberius. It was returned to a son of its former king, (Dio Cass. **60**, 8) in A. D. 41, when the Senate, on the accession of Claudius, obtained control. Under the popular party in A. D. 73 it again became an imperial province. Pontus, in Asia Minor, and also the Cottian Alps, would seem from the form of narration (Sueton. *Nero*, c. 18) to have peacefully become imperial provinces when Seneca and Burrhus swayed Roman affairs. The allegation that Caligula granted to Antiochus all the revenues of Commagene for the time that it had been a Roman province, was probably a political fabrication after the death of Caligula for the purpose of facilitating or concealing some enormous depletion of the prince's treasury in the interest of his enemies.

Jews at Alexandria was simply the establishment of a dependent king under another name.[37] He and his co-adjutors belonged — in the only instance where we can determine their politics — to the senatorial, rather than the imperial, faction. This is obvious from the alabarch's imprisonment by Caligula, and release when the Senate under Claudius obtained control, as also from the fact that Philo, brother of the alabarch, defends the outrageous seizure of Flaccus.

Two instances at least occur of a province or provinces being transferred by the Senate to the prince, both in the time of Tiberius. Achaia and Macedonia asked relief from taxes, and were thereupon transferred,[38] — a pretty sure sign that princely taxation was less onerous than senatorial. At a later date, a freebooter rendered an African province more expense probably than profit. It also was, for a time at least, turned over to Tiberius.[39]

§ IV. *Regicide.*

Three cotemporary aspirants for, and incumbents of, the throne, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, perished in civil broil. Their deaths cannot fairly be included under the present head. Julius Cæsar, Caligula, and Domitian were assassinated. Nero was forced to self-murder. The

---

[37] **Josephus,** after mentioning that a large part of Alexandria was assigned to Jews, says : "Their ethnarch [or national ruler] is appointed who administers [the affairs of] the nation, gives judicial decisions, superintends συμβολαίων (public agreements) and προσταγμάτων (ordinances), as if ruler of an independent state." — *Antiq.* **14,** 7, 2.

[38] "It was decided by the Senate *placuit* that Achaia and Macedonia, which were pleading against their burdens, should, for the present, be relieved of proconsular rule and turned over to Cæsar." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **1,** 76. When these provinces had recuperated and could bear fleecing, the Senate (**Sueton.** *Claud.* 25 ; **Dio Cass. 60,** 24) reassumed control. When the popular party, under Vespasian, regained power, they were returned (**Sueton.** *Vesp.* 8) to the prince.

[39] In A. D. 17 apparently, Tacfarinas (Tacitus, *An.* **2,** 52) commenced his military operations, and in A. D. 21 "it was decreed concerning Africa [by the Senate] that Cæsar should select the person to whom it should be committed." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **3,** 32.

Emperors assassinated were all ANTI-senatorial; nor can there be any doubt that in each of the three cases a majority of the Senate was engaged in the plot. We are told by Juvenal (**5**, 36) that a senatorial leader used, with his son-in-law, to celebrate the birthdays of Brutus and Cassius, crowned with laurel.

Among the popular party, murder, as a political remedy, would seem to have had less standing than among the aristocracy.

§ v. *Slavery.*[40]

Slavery was common among heathens, but Jews, if we except their kings, can rarely have been slaveholders during the century before and that after the Christian era. Jewish and Christian writings mention, not infrequently, slaves, or freedmen, of heathen, but not of Jewish, masters. Among heathens slavery was in some respects less, and in others far more, severe than as it lately existed in this country.[41] The aristocracy, rather than the popular party, evinced contempt towards,[42] and

---

[40] Compare notes on pp. 172, 223, 315, 320, 325, 455.

[41] Many slaves were educated. When this meant that opportunities of education were not denied to slave children, it implies that they were better treated than slave children in this country. When it meant that men or women of education were by fraud or violence, in peace or war, converted into slaves, it constituted a most repulsive feature of ancient servitude. Another inhuman feature was the law that, when a master was killed, his slaves should all be put to death.

Cicero, after capturing Pindenissus, sold the inhabitants for slaves, and, while the sale was going on, wrote to his friend Atticus (*Ad Attic.* **5**, 20): "While I write from my tribunal the result amounts already to twelve million sesterces," about $480,000. According to the New American Cyclopædia, **14**, 699, which, however, gives no reference, the number of slaves sold on this occasion was about ten thousand.

[42] Augustus assigned to foreign ambassadors, at the public spectacles, the same class of seats as to senators. He found himself afterwards obliged, in deference towards senatorial feeling, to change this (Sueton. *Aug.* 44), because one or more of such ambassadors had proved to be freedmen. Compare also (Ch. VII. note 18) the feeling towards Quintus Cicero, caused by his placing a freedman in an elevated position.

favored severe legislation [43] concerning, slaves and freed-

[43] Compare Patricianism in cc. V. note 8, VII. note 86, X. note 124, with a law of Domitian (?) or Nerva (?) mentioned by Plutarch in Ch. X. note 82. The patricians, who from A. D. 41 to A. D. 54, while Claudius was Emperor, had had their own way, endeavored, during the earlier years of Nero's reign, to carry matters with an equally high hand. In A. D. 56, "the Senate took into consideration the malpractices of the freedmen; and it demanded importunately 'that patrons should have a right of revoking the enfranchisement of delinquents.' For this many were ready to vote; but the consuls, afraid to put the question without apprising the prince, acquainted him in writing with the general opinion of the Senate, and consulted him whether he would become the author of this constitution, since it was opposed by few." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **13**, 26, Bohn's trans. Perhaps the rendering should be, "acquainted him in writing with the *consensum* almost unanimous opinion of the Senate that he should be the mover of the enactment." In either case, it was a piece of political strategy, which meant, "We desire, for our own advantage, permission to make slaves out of freedmen, but we wish you to bear all the odium of being the responsible author of such an enactment." "Nero wrote to the Senate, that they should investigate the cases of freedmen individually, whenever they were prosecuted by their patrons; but in nothing retrench the rights of the body."— **Tacitus**, *An.* **13**, 27, Bohn's trans.

The Emperor Claudius, in whose reign patricianism held complete control, had been its mere tool, and had saved the Senate all need of odious legislation. "He confiscated the estates of all freedmen who presumed to take upon themselves the equestrian rank. Such of them as were ungrateful to their patrons, and were complained of by them, he reduced to their former condition of slavery, and declared to their advocates that he would ALWAYS GIVE JUDGMENT AGAINST THE FREEDMEN, in any suit at law which the masters might happen to have with them." — **Sueton.** *Claud.* 25, Bohn's trans.

The disposition of the patricians on this subject is strongly manifested by the comment of **Tacitus** upon the legal decision concerning Paris. "Domitia, Nero's aunt, was deprived of Paris, her freedman, under color of a civil right; not without the dishonor of the prince, since by his command was given a judgment which pronounced him free-born."— *An.* **13**, 27. That the court should sustain a man's claim to having been free-born, was deemed disgraceful.

In A. D. 21, "a decree of the Senate also passed, equally tending to the vindication of justice [!] and security, 'that if any one was killed by

men. Some held slaves by thousands, and perhaps took

---

his slaves, those too, who, by his will, were made free under the same roof, should be executed amongst his other slaves.'" — **Tacitus**, *An.* **13**, 32, Bohn's trans.

In A. D. 61, "Pedanius Secundus, prefect of the city, was murdered by his own slave. . . . Now, since according to ANCIENT CUSTOM, the whole family of slaves who upon such occasion abode under the same roof must be subjected to capital punishment, such was the conflux of the people, who were desirous of saving so many innocent lives, that matters proceeded even to sedition; IN THE SENATE ITSELF were some who were favorable to the popular side, and rejected such excessive rigor; while many, on the contrary, voted against admitting any innovation; of these last was Caius Cassius. . . . Though no particular senator ventured to combat this judgment of Cassius, it was responded to by the dissonant voices of such as commiserated the number affected, the age of some, the sex of others, the undoubted innocence of very many of them; it was, however, CARRIED BY THE PARTY, who adjudged all to death. But it could not be executed, the populace gathering tumultuously together, and threatening vehemently that they would resort to stones and firebrands. Nero, therefore, rebuked the people in an edict, and, with lines of soldiers, secured all the way, through which the condemned were led to execution. Cingonius Varro had moved that the freedmen too who abode under the same roof should be deported from Italy; but this was prohibited by the prince, who urged, 'that the USAGE OF ANTIQUITY, which had not been relaxed from compassion, ought not to be made more stringent from cruelty.'" — **Tacitus**, *An.* **14**, 42–45, Bohn's trans.

The popular party, unfortunately, had no representative assembly elected by itself, through which legislation might be improved. To wrong and cruelty it could only oppose violence — a remedy so dangerous, that many who sympathized with the object shrunk from the means. A prince or a subordinate officer of the popular party had to execute what he abhorred. On deference for old customs, compare Ch. II. note 41.

In A. D. 52, when aristocratic reaction under Claudius reached its culmination, a law was enacted (**Tacitus**, *An.* **12**, 53) that every woman who married a slave, without knowledge of his master, should become a slave, or if, with the master's knowledge, should be degraded to the position of a freedwoman. This law was passed at a date when many slaves were more educated than their masters. It must have been unpopular, for the consul elect favored giving "pretorian ornaments and fifteen million sesterces" to its originator. If **Suetonius** (*Vespas.* 11)

pride in having them from diverse nationalities.[44] Many slaves were purchased for their capacity as pugilists, wrestlers, or gladiators, and not a few because of personal beauty, or for capacity as clowns and jesters. The aggregation into one mass of human beings, without moral or other discipline, with no common objects, and many of them trained to fighting, could not but occasion unhappiness and crime. It need not cause wonder that some deemed every slave an enemy.[45] Neither were the slaves a terror to the household only. A whole neighborhood must often have suffered from these lawless bands.

§ VI. *Expensive Living.*

From the battle of Actium (B. C. 31), when the aristocracy obtained nearly complete control, until the accession of Vespasian, when their power was more effectually crippled than at any intermediate period, an inordinately expensive habit of living was in vogue among the wealthier Romans.[46] The explanation by Tacitus of its decay is insufficient.[47] The only satisfactory explanation is, that

---

be correct, that a similar law was enacted in the time of Vespasian, he must err in supposing that Vespasian prompted it. Patricianism, in the time of Suetonius, had control of the book-markets, and was skilful in making its enemies responsible for its own more odious acts. Vespasian's cherished wife was a freedwoman. He was uninfected by patrician sentiment on this subject.

[44] "What should first be prohibited . . . the number and nationality, *numerum et nationes*, of our slaves." — **Tiberius** in **Tacitus**, *An.* **3**, 53.

[45] "The proverb is current: '*As many slaves* [*as we have*] *so many* [*are*] *our enemies.*' We do not have them [originally] as enemies, we make them such." — **Seneca**, *Epist.* **47**, 3, 4.

[46] "The luxury of the table which, from the battle of Actium to the revolution by which Galba obtained the Empire, a space of a hundred years, was practised with the most costly profusion, began then gradually to decline." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **3**, 55, Bohn's trans.

[47] "Men of no family, frequently chosen senators from the municipal towns, from the colonies, and even from the provinces, brought with them the frugality they observed at home; and though, by good fortune or industry, many of them grew wealthy as they grew old, yet their for-

when the popular party under Vespasian came into partial possession of power, patricians were no longer able to fleece the provinces so extensively as before, and were compelled by lack of means to retrench their style of living. So long as extravagance was paid for by the provincials, no remedy was found. Some doubtless desired a remedy; for — since all cannot have been equally favored with official spoils — some found themselves on the road to ruin. Such men, instead of acting independently and refusing to imitate extravagance, wished a legal restriction put upon others, that these others might not outshine them.[48] They naturally were not ambitious to be deemed

---

mer habits continued. But Vespasian was the great promoter of parsimonious living, himself a pattern of primitive strictness in his person and table: hence the compliance of the public with the manners of the prince, and the gratification of imitating him, operated more powerfully than the terror of laws and all their penalties. Or perhaps all human things go a certain round, and there are revolutions in manners analogous to the vicissitudes of the seasons." — *Ibid.*, Bohn's trans.

[48] "At home some severe measures were apprehended against luxury, which was carried beyond all bounds in everything which involved a profuse expenditure. But the more pernicious instances of extravagance were covered, as the cost was generally a secret; while from the sums spent in gluttony and revelry, as they were the subject of daily animadversion, apprehensions were raised of some severe corrective from a prince WHO OBSERVED HIMSELF THE ANCIENT PARSIMONY. For Caius Bibulus, having begun the complaint, the other ediles took it up and declared 'that the sumptuary laws were despised; the pomp and expense of plate and entertainments, in spite of restraints, increased daily, and by moderate penalties the evil could not be stopped.' This grievance thus represented to the Senate was by them referred entirely to the Emperor. Tiberius . . . wrote at last to the Senate in this manner: . . . 'What is it that I am first to prohibit, what excess retrench to the ancient standard? Am I to begin with that of our country-seats, spacious without bounds; and with the number of domestics, from various countries? or with the quantity of silver and gold? or with the pictures, and statues of brass, the wonders of art? or with vestments, promiscuously worn by men and women? or with what is peculiar to the women, — those precious stones, — for the purchase of which our coin is carried into foreign or hostile nations?" — **Tacitus**, *An.* **3**, 52, 53, Bohn's trans. The frugality of Tiberius was that of a conscientious man. The state-

authors of such a law, but under pretence of deference wished the prince to assume its authorship and odium.[49]

Other witnesses than Tacitus testify to costly Roman gluttony. Seneca dwells upon the almost or altogether beastly habits of gormandizing and ruinous consequences to health.[50] He tells us: "You will not wonder that diseases are innumerable. Count the cooks. All study is at an end, and professors of liberal knowledge without attendance preside over deserted localities. There is solitude in the schools of rhetoricians and philosophers. But how celebrated are cooks!"[51] Among the books discovered at Herculaneum, not a few seem to have been upon cookery.[52] Tiberius, Vespasian, and Domitian discoun-

---

ments that he and Vespasian imitated ancient frugality are but an indirect method of giving to antiquity an undeserved credit. Patricians of earlier times were limited by their means more than by conscience or inclination, and consequently their means, though less extensive, were, as in the case of Lucullus, largely used for display. In the days of Pompey it had already become customary to make room for a good dinner by taking an emetic beforehand.

[49] "These excesses are censured, and a regulation is demanded; and yet, if an equal law were made, if equal penalties were prescribed, these very censors would loudly complain, 'that the state was utterly overturned, THAT EVERY ILLUSTRIOUS HOUSE WAS MENACED WITH RUIN, and that every citizen was exposed to criminal informations.' . . . If any of the magistrates, from a confidence in his own strictness of principle and energy, will undertake to stem the progress of so great an evil, he has my praises, and my acknowledgment that he disburdens me of part of my labors; but if their will is merely to declaim against abuses, and, when they have gained applause for the same, leave me to bear the odium of proposing the measures they recommend, believe me, conscript fathers, I too am not fond of giving offence; and though I am content to encounter heavy and for the most part unmerited animosities, for the good of the commonwealth, I am justified in deprecating such as are uncalled for and superfluous, and can be of no service either to me or to yourselves." —**Tacitus**, *An.* **3**, 54, Bohn's trans.

[50] **Seneca**, *Epist.* **95**, 15–29. Gout is specified as common among women, owing to their way of life.

[51] *Ibid.* 23.

[52] "At Herculaneum . . . the titles of four hundred of those [books or rolls of papyrus] least injured, which have been read, are found to be

tenanced patrician table-customs, though the prominent motive of each was perhaps different. To Vespasian, a simple man, these table-habits would have been annoying.[53] To Domitian, who was systematically industrious, they would have been a loss of time.[54] Tiberius was of a nature to share both objections, but would, in a greater degree than either of the others, have felt moral repugnance to prevailing customs. The same piece of meat appeared twice upon his table,[55] and when an inordinately expensive fish was sent him he declined to have it cooked.[56] Table extravagance was but one of the forms in which Romans wasted their property.

§ VII. *Suppression of Documents.*

Misrepresentation of history attends all violent struggles. Destruction of history, or of documents important

---

unimportant works, but all entirely new, chiefly relating to MUSIC, RHETORIC, and COOKERY." —**Lyell,** *Geology,* **2,** 157, 4th London edition.

[53] The triumphal procession of Vespasian tired him out, and thereby, in his own opinion, served him rightly (Sueton. *Vespas.* c. 12) for having wished it. Suetonius differs somewhat from Tacitus concerning the table of Vespasian, saying, "He entertained constantly and often in true and costly manner TO AID THE PROVISION-DEALERS." — **Sueton.** *Vespas.* c. 19. This reads however like the defence of some friend who did not like to hear the Emperor blamed for parsimony.

[54] See Ch. X. note 25.

[55] "To encourage frugality in the public by his own example, he would often, at his solemn feasts, have at his table victuals which had been served up the day before, and were partly eaten, and half a boar, affirming, 'It has all the same good bits that the whole had." — **Sueton.** *Tiberius,* c. 34, Bohn's trans.

[56] A mullet, according to Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* **9,** 17), rarely exceeded two pounds. Some one sent a large one weighing four and a half pounds to Tiberius. He apparently did not care to be quoted as having extravagant delicacies, and sent it to the provision-dealer, remarking, "Friends, I am much deceived if Apicius or Publius Octavius does not buy that mullet." — **Seneca,** *Epist.* **95,** 42. The dealer put it up at auction, and Octavius bought it for five thousand sesterces. Even the bitter political enemies of Tiberius attribute to him no tinge of avarice. His pleasantry contains the best indication of his motive for not retaining the fish.

to its comprehension, implies excess of unfairness, or of timidity, or of both, in the party or individual resorting to it. The instances of it in Roman history are attributable, unless possibly in the case of Domitian, to the senatorial party.

The burning in B. C. 181 of books alleged to have been written by Numa,[57] indicates patrician intolerance, but the detriment which it caused to history must have been slight.

Augustus established a censorship of publications (Tac. *An.* **1**, 72), and suppressed papers left by Julius Cæsar.[58] The subjection of Augustus during many years to patrician influence, and the manner in which he carried out its behests, render certain that his censorship bore chiefly on the popular party, and raise suspicion that some of his uncle's suppressed writings, instead of being unimportant, were such as the aristocracy wished out of the way. In this connection the suppression or publication of senatorial action has an interest. The Senate, when allowed its own way, became a secret conclave. The great popular leader caused its action to be published, thus rendering it more responsible to public opinion.[59]

The destruction and secretion of Sibylline compositions,

---

[57] See Appendix, Note A, foot-note 14.

[58] "Certain works are alleged to have been written by him [Julius Cæsar] in boyhood and early manhood, as *Praises of Hercules; Œdipus*, a tragedy; also *Maxims* [or *Proverbial Sayings*], all which booklets Augustus, in a brief and plain epistle to Pompeius Macer,— to whom he had delegated the arrangement of libraries, — forbade '*publicari* to be placed within reach of the public' (or, perhaps, 'to be sold by booksellers')."— **Sueton.** *Cæsar*, 56. The Hercules and Œdipus, works probably of no consequence, may have been included in the prohibition as a means of withdrawing attention from *Maxims*, which the aristocracy did not care to have in circulation backed by Cæsar's authority.

[59] Julius Cæsar "introduced a new regulation, that the daily acts both of the Senate and people should be committed to writing and published." — **Sueton.** *Cæsar*, 20, Bohn's trans. Augustus made "several other alterations in the management of public affairs, among which were these following: That the acts of the Senate should NOT be published. . . ."— **Sueton.** *August.* 36, Bohn's trans.

whatever the pretext, was but an effort by the senatorial faction to prevent perusal of a document whose authority they had recognized and whose influence (see Ch. VII. notes 65, 67, 68) annoyed them.

Caligula committed to the flames all record of testimony against his mother. This, however, was an act of kindness, not to his own party, but to his senatorial opponents. It was not meant to obscure history, but to assure individuals, that at his hands they need not fear for the past. It should be classed under *forgiveness*, rather than *suppression* of facts. He permitted the perusal of works which the Senate had endeavored in the two preceding reigns to suppress.[60]

The further destruction of documents under his successor was an effort of the aristocracy to conceal their own misdeeds.[61]

During the senatorial conspiracy against Domitian, a biography of Helvidius Priscus, written by one of the conspirators, a biography which not improbably advocated or lauded assassination,[62] was suppressed by a decree of the Senate, that body fearing to be held accountable for it. The inference may or may not be correct that Domitian called for its suppression. He is also charged (Sueton. *Domit.* 10) with punishing liberty of speech. Whether and how far the misdeeds of his antagonist, the Senate, have been attributed to him, may be a ques-

[60] See Appendix, Note G, foot-note 114. "To relieve prosecutors and witnesses against his mother and brothers from all apprehension, he brought the records of their trials into the forum, and there burnt them, calling loudly on the gods to witness that he had not read or handled them." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 15, Bohn's tr. alt'd. "The writings of Titus Labienus, Cordus Cremutius, and Cassius Severus, which had been suppressed by an act of the Senate, he permitted to be drawn from obscurity, and universally read."— **Sueton.** *Calig.* 16, Bohn's trans.

[61] Claudius "showed to the Senate the books of Protogenes, whom also he put to death, and the writings which Caligula pretended [?] to have burned, . . . and gave them [?] for perusal to the writers and [or?] to those against whom they were written, and after this burned them." — **Dio Cass. 60**, 4.

[62] Compare Ch. X. note 37.

tion. If the Senate charged its own crimes upon Tiberius and Caligula, it was equally likely and had but too much opportunity to do the same towards Domitian.

At the close of the third century, destruction of Christian records by the dominant patrician party was common.[63]

About the same time, destruction to Cicero's writings was advocated; probably because they were thought to make standing ground for monotheism.[64]

No charge is made against Emperors of the popular party, even by their enemies, that they destroyed patrician literature. In later centuries suppression of writings was reintroduced by ecclesiastical and secular rulers. In modern continental Europe prohibition or destruction of literature has been systematized as a regular governmental function entitled, *Censorship of the Press*.[65]

---

[63] "With our own eyes we beheld the inspired and sacred writings given, in the middle of the market-places, to the fire." — **Euseb.** *Eec. Hist.* **8**, 2. Compare Mosheim, *De Rebus* (*Commentaries on the Affairs of Christians before Constantine*), Cent. **4**, § II.; in Murdock's edit. see especially pp. 417, 423, 426, 427.

[64] "I know that there are not a few who turn their backs and run away from [hearing] his (Cicero's) books, . . . and I hear others mutter indignantly and say, that the Senate ought to enact a decree for the destruction of these writings, which prove the Christian religion and crush out the AUTHORITY OF ANTIQUITY." — **Arnob.** *Adv. Gent.* **3**, 7.

[65] Censorship of the press is sometimes political, sometimes theological, and sometimes practical. What cannot be published in one country is occasionally published in another and surreptitiously introduced where forbidden. The fourth edition of the *Conversations-Lexicon*, published in Saxony (a later edition of which furnished the basis of the Encyclopædia Americana), was, during the author's visit to Germany, under ban of the Prussian censorship. Von Raumer's *Fall of Poland* was, as a compliment to Russia, in the same category. The *Leipziger Allgemeine Zeitung*, a leading German newspaper, was, during his stay there, forbidden to circulate in Hanover.

An instance of the practical kind came under his observation in a proof-sheet of an English newspaper, published at Leipsic, containing the censor's annotations. Some passage, intended to be humorous, ridiculed the uniform of a Leipsic military company. Opposite was written, *Kann*

§ VIII. *Sympathy of the Jewish with the Roman Aristocracy.*

To some extent the Jewish aristocracy sympathized, or at least co-operated, with the Roman. Materials for determining their relations are scanty, and it is difficult to say whether this held true of their whole body, or of a majority, or merely of a minority. A portion may have co-operated openly; a larger number may have done the same indirectly.

The aristocracy at Jerusalem, as depicted by Josephus and the New Testament writers, were, with slight exceptions, more devoted to class privileges than to the common welfare. Herod the Great and Herod Agrippa *Senior*, who were closely in league with the patrician faction at Rome, found support in the aristocracy of Judæa, rather than among the middle and lower classes. The inference seems fair, that co-operation, direct or indirect, existed between the ruling classes at Rome and Jerusalem.

If we now turn to Alexandria, we find at one date — the beginning of Caligula's reign — a somewhat similar state of things. The various persons to be mentioned need a prefatory word.

Flaccus had, five years before the death of Tiberius, been appointed by him to a six years' term of office as governor at Alexandria. If we may credit that portion of Philo's narrative which cannot be attributed to self-exculpation or other bad motive, he was a man of unusual administrative ability and moral worth.[66]

---

nicht stehend bleiben ("Must not remain"). The ridicule, even if uncalled for, would, in this country, have hardly excited remark; yet the censor, an intelligent historian, probably deemed it a duty to suppress what might cause feeling. Compare Ch. XIII. note 7.

[66] The following is a confession wrung doubtless from Philo by public opinion at Alexandria: "This Flaccus being chosen by Tiberius Cæsar as one of his INTIMATE COMPANIONS, was, after the death of Severus, who had been lieutenant-governor in Egypt, appointed viceroy of Alexandria and the country round about, being a man who at the beginning,

Philo, the well-known Jewish writer, identifies himself unmistakably with patricianism by his remarks on Seja-

---

as far as appearance went, had given innumerable instances of his excellence, for he was a man of prudence and diligence, and great acuteness of perception, very energetic in executing what he had determined on, very eloquent as a speaker, and skilful too at discerning what was suppressed, as well as at understanding what was said. Accordingly, in a short time he became perfectly acquainted with the affairs of Egypt, and they are of a very various and diversified character, so that they are not easily comprehended even by those who from their earliest infancy have made them their study.

"The scribes were a superfluous body when he had made such advances towards the knowledge of all things, whether important or trivial, by his extended experience, that he not only surpassed them, but from his great accuracy was qualified instead of a pupil to become the instructor of those who had hitherto been the teachers of all persons. . . . He decided all suits of importance in conjunction with the magistrates, he pulled down the over-proud, he forbade promiscuous mobs of men from all quarters to assemble together, and prohibited all associations and meetings which were continually feasting together under pretence of sacrifices, making a drunken mockery of public business, treating with great vigor and severity all who resisted his commands.

"Then, when he had filled the whole city and country with his wise legislation, he proceeded in turn to regulate the military affairs of the land, issued commands, arranging matters, training the troops of every kind, infantry, cavalry, and light-armed ; teaching the commanders not to deprive the soldiers of their pay, and so drive them to acts of piracy and rapine ; and teaching each individual soldier not to proceed to any actions unauthorized by his military service, remembering that he was appointed with the especial object of preserving peace. . . .

"Having received a government which was intended to last six years, for the first five years, while Tiberius Cæsar was alive, he both preserved peace, and also governed the country generally with such vigor and energy that he was superior to all the governors who had gone before him. But in the last year, after Tiberius was dead, and when Caius had succeeded him as Emperor, he began to relax in and to be indifferent about everything [?], whether it was that he was overwhelmed with most heavy grief because of Tiberius (for it was evident to every one that he grieved exceedingly AS IF FOR A NEAR RELATION . . .), or whether it was because he was disaffected to his successor." — **Philo**, *Against Flaccus*, cc. 1, 3 ; Vol. **4**, 61–63, Bohn's trans.

nus.[67] Other of his observations accord with this view,[68] but its chief support will be found in his elaborate defence of patrician crime.

Alexander Lysimachus, alabarch or ethnarch of the Jews at Alexandria, the wealthiest of his cotemporaries there, and brother of Philo, must have belonged to the

---

[67] Philo opens his work *Against Flaccus* with the assumption — not assertion — that Sejanus prompted the anti-Jewish proceedings in the time of Tiberius, which must mean the enactments of A. D. 19. The falsehood, however gross, may have been dangerous to answer or difficult of disproof in a provincial city at the date when he wrote. Compare his *Embassy*, c. 24. A noteworthy circumstance is, that he nowhere seeks patrician favor at the expense of Tiberius. The time was not yet arrived when either Jews, or the better class of heathens IN THE PROVINCES, would have borne to hear him disparaged.

[68] **Philo** lauds Agrippa, patrician leader under Augustus, for his practical monotheism, because "every day that he remained in the city, 'by reason of his friendship for Herod, he went to that sacred place [the temple], being delighted with the spectacle of the building, and of the sacrifices, and all the ceremonies connected with the worship of God, and the regularity which was observed, and the dignity and honor paid to the high-priest, and HIS GRANDEUR WHEN ARRAYED IN HIS SACRED VESTMENTS and when about to begin the sacrifices. And after he had adorned the temple with all the offerings in his power to contribute, . . . he was conducted back again to the sea-coast, . . . being greatly admired and respected for his piety [εὐσέβεια, practical-monotheism].'" — *Embassy to Caius*, c. 37, Bohn's trans. ; Paris edit. p. 726. In the same work (c. 20, p. 695) he alleges, that the adornments upon the synagogues IN HONOR OF THE EMPERORS, such as "gilded (or perhaps inlaid) shields and crowns as also pillars and inscriptions" were a reason why the synagogues themselves should have been spared. And (*Against Flaccus*, c. 7, p. 667) he complains, that the Jews, if deprived of their synagogues, could no longer evince "practical-monotheism towards their benefactors," meaning, apparently, by religious services in their behalf. This inability "they would regard as WORSE THAN TEN THOUSAND DEATHS, since they would have no sacred precincts wherein to express their gratitude." He endeavors to impress this view by repetition. "To the Jews everywhere in the world their synagogues are obviously means of inciting religious fidelity towards the house of Augustus. If these were destroyed, what other place, or method, of showing honor would be left?" — *Ibid.* Language of this kind causes distrust of its author.

same political school.[69] He was arrested by Caligula, probably for connection with patrician crime, was released by the aristocracy when they attained power under Claudius and this release was coincident with a rebellion, and violent suppression, of what seems to have been the Jewish commonalty at Alexandria. His son was afterwards, during patrician dominance, made procurator of Judæa. That this son turned heathen need cause no surprise.[70]

A Jewish council had been instituted at Alexandria by Augustus.[71] This was some years after Antony's defeat, and it must have been selected from among those friendly to patricianism. As thirty-eight members of it were at one time arrested, its whole number may have been seventy, the favorite Jewish one.

Herod Agrippa *Senior* had, because of his mother's friendship with Antonia,[72] early intercourse with the family of Tiberius. The Senate had probably, during the lifetime of that Emperor, employed this man to sound, and if possible to intrigue with, Caligula against his uncle.[73] Tiberius, confident perhaps in Caligula's affection for himself, took at first no action in the matter. Antonia, whose goodness of heart prevented mistrust of one whose mother had been dear to her, importuned Tiberius for a judicial

---

[69] See pp. 84, 85, and compare Josephus, *Antiq.* **19**, 5, 1; **20**, 5, 2.

[70] Josephus mentions (*Antiq.* **20**, 5, 2) that Tiberius Alexander, son of the alabarch, was made procurator of Judæa and deserted Judaism.

[71] Philo, *Against Flaccus*, 10, *Opp.* Paris edit. p. 670.

[72] Herod Agrippa "requested Antonia . . . to lend him the three hundred thousand (drachmæ) . . . and she, for the recollection of his mother Bernice, with whom she had been exceedingly intimate, and for his own sake, as he had been brought up among the companions of [her son] Claudius, gave him the money." — **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **18**, 6, 4. Concerning Antonia, see Appendix, Note G, foot-note 56.

[73] Herod "betook himself to pay his respects to Caius [Caligula] . . . . Now . . . there happened some words to pass between them, as they once were in a chariot together, concerning Tiberius; Agrippa praying [to God] (for they two sat by themselves), that 'Tiberius might soon go off the stage, and leave the government to Caius, who was in every respect more worthy of it.'" — **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **18**, 6, 4, 5, Whiston's trans.

investigation. To this he at last consented, though with the remark that she might find the matter more serious than she supposed.[74]

We now come to the train of events. Caligula was taken ill in August of A. D. 37.[75] The illness endangered life, and lasted for weeks certainly, if not for months.[76] He can hardly have been confined to bed before the aristocracy were plotting a recovery of their ancient power. Herod was despatched to Alexandria with a fleet and a commission *from the Senate* as its general,[77] — a commission which violated the Roman constitution, that had been in force for almost seventy years.[78] He landed furtively in that city,[79] and early in October Flac-

---

[74] When Antonia, at Herod's request, besought an investigation, Tiberius replied, " . . . but if when [Eutyches, freedman and coachman of Herod] is put to the torture, his statements shall be verified, beware lest [Herod], while desiring to punish his freedman, shall rather invoke justice on himself." — **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **18**, 6, 6. Antonia, at Herod's request, again urged the matter, and he answered, " I shall do it not of my own judgment, but driven to it by your importunity." — *Ibid.* Herod, when his request was granted, became frightened (*Ibid.*), and resorted to supplication.

[75] " In the eighth month [August] a severe disease attacked Caius." — **Philo**, *Embassy*, 2, p. 682. His alleged dedication, August 31, A. D. 37, of a hero monument [temple ?] to Augustus (Dio Cass. **59**, 7) is probably, or, if the date on a medal, A. D. 39, be adopted (see Dio Cass., Vol. **6**, p. 317, note 66), is certainly a patrician falsehood. Cp. Ch. VIII. note 55.

[76] Bulletins concerning the progress of the disease and recovery were carried, if we can trust Philo (*Against Flaccus*, c. 3, Paris edit. p. 663) to the extremities of the empire. When the sickness threatened a fatal issue, he appointed his sister Drusilla (Sueton. *Calig.* 24) heir to the empire.

[77] **Philo**, *Against Flaccus*, c. 6, Paris edit. p. 666, ll. 29, 30.

[78] Compare note 33 and text prefixed. Tacitus says (*An.* **2**, 59) that Augustus forbade any senator to visit Egypt without his permission.

[79] Herod Agrippa "embarked with his followers and had a fair voyage, and so a few days afterwards he arrived at his journey's end, unforeseen and unexpected, having commanded the captains [pilots] . . . to furl their sails, and keep a short distance out of sight in the open sea, until it became late in the evening and dark, and then at night he entered the port, that when he disembarked he might find all the citizens buried in

cus was kidnapped at a friend's table and carried off by night.[80] If a thread, at least, of truth runs through Philo's subsequent narrative, he was carried to Italy, put through the form of what must have been a mock trial, banished, and subsequently murdered.[81] The motive for his murder may have been, that, with recovery of Caligula, Flaccus would acquire means of redress. His house had been the abode of taste and refinement. Its contents, contrary to law and precedent, were appropriated by some of the thieves into whose hands he had fallen.[82] The allegation, that the goods were seized on behalf of Caligula,

---

sleep, and so, without any one seeing him, he might arrive at the house of the man who was to be his entertainer. With so much modesty [wiliness?] then did this man arrive, wishing if it were possible to enter without being perceived by any one in the city."—**Philo,** *Against Flaccus*, c. 5, Bohn's trans. ; Paris edit. p. 665.

[80] Afterwards, in concert with Herod Agrippa, "Bassus, the centurion, was sent from Italy; . . . he ordered the captain of the ship to keep out in the open sea till sunset, intending to enter the city unexpectedly, in order that Flaccus might not be aware of his coming. . . .

"And when the evening came, the ship entered the harbor, and Bassus, disembarking with his own soldiers, advanced, neither recognizing nor being recognized by any one; and on his road finding a soldier who was one of the quaternions of the guard, he ordered him to show him the house of his captain. . . .

"And when he heard that he was supping at some person's house in company with Flaccus, he did not relax in his speed, but hastened onward to the dwelling of his entertainer; . . . and lying in ambush at a short distance, he sent forward one of his own followers to reconnoitre, disguising him like a servant. . . . So he, entering into the banqueting-room, as if he were the servant of one of the guests, examined everything accurately, and then returned and gave information to Bassus. And he, when he had learnt the unguarded condition of the entrances, and the small number of the people who were with Flaccus, . . . hastened forward, and entered suddenly into the supper-room, he and the soldiers with him, . . . and surrounded Flaccus. . . . The time of his arrest . . . was the general festival of the Jews at the time of the autumnal equinox."—**Philo,** *Against Flaccus*, cc. 12–14, Bohn's trans. altered ; Paris edit. pp. 672–674.

[81] **Philo,** *Against Flaccus*, cc. 18, 19, 21 ; Paris edit. pp. 678, 679, 681.

[82] "He was immediately stripped of all his possessions, both of those

may have been invented at the time, as a means of warding off opposition, or subsequently to cloak crime, or the explanation may be that below in note 82.

The conspirators at Alexandria must have had partial success. Whether they were put down by a lieutenant of Flaccus, or by some one sent from Rome, can only be conjectured, for Philo's object was not to illuminate, but to obscure, the whole matter. Thirty-eight members of the Jewish council were arrested.[83] Philo's brother, perhaps immediately, perhaps after tedious prosecution, was put in chains and remained so until Caligula's death.[84]

Macro, the experienced officer, was appointed — possibly after a preliminary visit — to take charge at Alexandria. Philo and his companions came in midwinter to Rome, doubtless that they might plead for the conspirators. A passage in Suetonius renders probable that they endeavored to influence Caligula through his grandmother, Antonia,[85] who had been an intimate friend of Herod's mother, and whose fiscal agent was Alexander

---

which he inherited from his parents and of all that he had acquired himself, having been a man who took especial delight in what was ornamental; . . . and besides that he collected a vast number of servants, carefully selected for their excellencies and accomplishments, . . . for every one of them was excellent in that employment to which he was appointed, so that he was looked upon as either the most excellent of all servants in that place, or, at all events, as inferior to no one.

"And there is a very clear proof of this in the fact that, though there were a vast number of properties confiscated, and sold for the public benefit, which belonged to persons who had been condemned, that of Flaccus alone was assigned to the Emperor, with perhaps ONE OR TWO MORE, in order, that the law which had been established . . . might not be violated." — **Philo,** *Against Flaccus,* 18, Bohn's trans. altered. 'One or two more,' means perhaps that other prominent members of the popular party had been murdered. Caligula may have retaken their property from the conspirators and returned it to their relatives. Cp. Note G, footnote 89.

[83] **Philo,** *Against Flaccus,* c. 10, Paris edit. p. 670.

[84] **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19,** 5, 1.

[85] "To his grandmother, Antonia, who asked a private interview, [Caligula] denied it except with the condition that Macro, the prefect should be present." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* c. 23.

Lysimachus, the chief offender. Her death, not long afterwards, may have been hastened by grief at the misdeeds of those whom she had trusted.

In A. D. 38, probably in the latter part of it, Macro disappears from history.[86] Means must have been found by the conspirators to put him out of the way.

A twofold embassy was sent from Alexandria to Rome,[87] probably with reference to this attempted revolt. Philo, who headed the Jewish delegation, wrote an account of their mission which covers eighty-one pages in Bohn's translation. But no attention on the reader's part will enable him to detect in this narrative any object for the embassy which could have justified either party in going ten steps to have it settled.

When Caligula had been murdered and the patricians came into power, Philo's brother was set at liberty. Concurrent therewith a revolt of the Alexandrine Jews took place,[88] — a revolt certainly from among such as did not sympathize with their alabarch or his doings.

Of Philo's two political works, that *Against Flaccus* and probably also the *Embassy to Caius* were written several years after the events to which they refer.[89] A plausible surmise would be that after expulsion of the Jews from Rome in A. D. 52 by Claudius, Philo saw strong need of diverting from himself and associates the indig-

---

[86] According to **Dio Cassius (59,** 10), Caligula "forced (Macro) to the necessity of suicide, though he had appointed him over Egypt." This is unquestionably one of the patrician accounts such as attribute the death of Sejanus to Tiberius. The desperate position of the rebel leaders at Alexandria and the dangerous position of those at Rome renders not improbable that some among them effected Macro's murder and called it suicide.

[87] **Josephus** says (*Antiq.* **18,** 8, 1) that each delegation consisted of three individuals. **Philo** (*Embassy to Caius*, c. 45, p. 730) mentions that the Jewish one numbered five. The heathen delegation was headed by Apion.

[88] **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19,** 5, 2.

[89] Philo speaks in his work *Against Flaccus* (c. 18, p. 677, lines 17, 18) of the matters there treated as already antiquated. In the beginning of his *Embassy* he treats himself as aged and gray-headed.

nation of Jews generally at his sympathy and co-operation with that Roman aristocracy whose tool Claudius was. The need of this diversion would not be diminished by the fact that Philo's nephew had turned heathen and accepted office from Claudius as stated in note 70.

The two works above mentioned justify disbelief in Philo's truthfulness. The one *Against Flaccus* represents that a governor, remarkable during five years for clear-headed equity, became, in the six months before he was kidnapped, a model of injustice.[90] Yet the same work states — and perhaps intends as a reason why he was kidnapped instead of being openly arrested — that he was "EXCEEDINGLY esteemed — πλειστῳ μέρει τῆς πόλεως — by nearly all the city,"[91] — a remark which must have included Jews, since Philo would otherwise have stated in self-defence, that only Gentiles retained a good opinion of him.

Philo attributes to Sejanus the measures against the Jews in the time of Tiberius.[92] We have, however, convincing evidence that they proceeded from the patricians,[93] who afterwards murdered Sejanus, and who were allies certainly of Philo's brother and almost unquestionably of himself.

He fabricates, and puts into the mouth of Macro, a statement that the latter had carried out the intentions of Tiberius against Sejanus.[94] But Philo lived when he

---

[90] For this alleged change of an upright man into everything blameworthy, Philo assigns two causes. The first is grief over the death of Tiberius, — a reason so utterly absurd that its author cannot be credited with believing it. The second is, that the death of Tiberius (grandson of the Emperor Tiberius), and subsequently the death of Macro, convinced Flaccus that he must look for support to the anti-Jewish party. (*Against Flaccus*, cc. 3, 4.) But the death of these men occurred, as Philo well knew, *subsequently* to the kidnapping of Flaccus, so that his gubernatorial conduct, as Philo also knew, could not have been influenced by it.

[91] **Philo**, *Against Flaccus*, c. 13 ; Paris edit. p. 673, line 20.

[92] *Against Flaccus*, c. 1 ; *Embassy to Caius*, c. 24.

[93] See Ch. VIII. § 1.

[94] *Embassy to Caius*, c. 6 ; Paris edit. p. 686, line 1.

cannot possibly have been ignorant that Tiberius and Macro were friends of Sejanus, who had punished, not him, but his murderers.[95]

The proceedings against the Alexandrine conspirators were in course of execution in A. D. 38, after the death of the emperor's sister, Drusilla,[96] and about August 31, the date of Caligula's birthday.[97] Yet Philo represents them as carried out under the direction of Flaccus, who, according to his own statement, had been kidnapped in the preceding year.

Herod, by his regal splendor, outshone the governor.[98] Yet Philo ascribes to modesty the furtive entry of this would-be king into Alexandria.[99]

The Senate, a body hostile to Caligula and greedy to recover its ancient power, had made Herod its general [100] in a province or provinces where it for nearly seventy years had been destitute of control. It authorized him to override Caligula's governor,[101] and this during Caligula's illness. Yet Philo wishes us to believe that Herod had been appointed king by Caligula.

The stay of Herod at Alexandria was evidently for weeks or months.[102] Yet Philo wishes us to believe that

---

[95] See Appendix, Note G, § III.

[96] *Against Flaccus*, c. 8 ; Paris edit. p. 668, line 17.

[97] *Against Flaccus*, c. 10; Paris edit. p. 670, line 42.

[98] "He attracts all eyes towards himself when they see the array of sentinels and body-guards around him adorned with silvered and gilded arms." *Against Flaccus*, c. 5, Bohn's trans. ; Paris edit. p. 655, lines 31 – 33.

[99] See note 79.

[100] See reference in note 77.

[101] "The residence here of this man means your ruin ; for he is invested with higher authority and dignity than yourself." — *Against Flaccus*, c. 5 ; Paris edit. p. 665, line 30.

[102] "They [the populace] having had the cue given them, spent all their days reviling the king in the public schools, and stringing together all sorts of gibes to turn him into ridicule ; and at times they employed poets who compose farces. . . . When . . . he [an insane man] had received all the insignia of royal authority, and had been dressed and adorned like a king, the young men bearing sticks on their shoulders

the cause of his coming to Alexandria was his haste[103] to reach a kingdom alleged to have been given him in Judæa or Syria, countries which he probably neither ruled nor visited during Caligula's reign.

Philo's effort at dramatic effect causes increased distrust of his truthfulness, and the speeches which he fabricates for Flaccus indicate a hypocritical willingness to assume divine protection for aristocratic misdeeds.[104]

The only probable inference to be eliminated from his misrepresentations is, that the Senate was plotting against Caligula. It wished, as twenty years previously, to detach one or more provinces from subordination to the prince and subject them to one of its own political allies, as a preliminary towards re-establishment of aristocratic control. It needed in this instance co-operation from the Jewish aristocracy, which had to be bought by selecting a Jew as intended king.[105] The Jewish aristocracy must

---

stood on each side of him instead of spear-bearers, in imitation of the body-guards of the king, and then others came up, some as if to salute him, and others making as if they wished to plead their cause before him, and others pretending to wish to consult with him about the affairs of the state." — **Philo,** *Against Flaccus,* cc. 5, 6, Bohn's trans. ; Paris edit. pp. 665, 666.

[103] "The merchant vessels which set forth from that harbor were fast sailers, and . . . the pilots were most experienced men, who guided their ships like skilful coachmen guide their horses, keeping them straight in the proper course." — **Philo,** *Against Flaccus,* c. 5, Bohn's trans. ; Paris edit. p. 665.

[104] "It is said . . . he would go forth out of his farm-house and raise his eyes to heaven and . . . would cry out, 'O King of gods and men ! you are not, then, indifferent to the Jewish nation, nor are the assertions which they relate with respect to your providence false ; but those men who say that that people has not you for their champion and defender, are far from a correct opinion.'" — *Against Flaccus,* c. 20, Bohn's trans.; Paris edit. p. 679.

[105] Jews, according to Philo (*Against Flaccus,* c. 8 ; Paris edit. p. 668, lines 9 – 12), occupied nearly the whole of two wards, and not a few were scattered through the remaining three wards, of Alexandria. This explains the large control of the Jewish council, or Sanhedrim, which is implied in the senatorial effort to operate through Jewish allies.

at first have had enough success to make them think of exacting terms for capitulation.[106]

Josephus makes no mention of Flaccus, nor of any persecution suffered by Alexandrine Jews during his rule, nor, in fact, during Caligula's reign. He does mention an insurrection after Caligula's death at the accession of Claudius, an insurrection doubtless of the popular party. The sufferings of the Jews at this last-mentioned period from PATRICIAN oppression have not improbably been ascribed by Philo to Flaccus, a ruler from THE POPULAR PARTY four years earlier. That we may comprehend the possibility of such untruth, we must remember that in the reign of Claudius (when Philo probably wrote) it was unsafe to contradict patrician falsehood, as the fate of more than one man in the arena at Rome indicates.[107] Gross falsehoods in the patrician interest passed without public correction, because correction would have been dangerous to the maker. If the Jews had been maltreated and oppressed during Caligula's reign, there would seem no reason for the failure of Josephus to mention it. If, on the other hand, their aristocracy were the aggressors, we can comprehend his remarkable brevity.[108]

When we come to the reign of Caligula, we shall find that his alleged appointment of Herod Agrippa was probably a fiction of later date to cover assumption by the latter of regal authority, and that his alleged purpose of erecting a statue in the temple was equally a fiction intended to divert odium from patrician Jews.

§ IX. *Murder of Body-Guards.*

The relative view of the patrician as compared with the popular party, touching sanctity of human life, has

---

[106] **Philo** attributes to Flaccus, what cannot well have happened until after he was kidnapped ; namely, that he "sent for our rulers, apparently to effect a reconciliation between them and the remainder of the city." — *Against Flaccus*, c. 10 ; Paris edit. p. 670, lines 12, 13.

[107] Compare pages 76, 77.

[108] "A dissension having arisen at Alexandria between the Jewish inhabitants and the Greeks, three ambassadors chosen from either side came to Caius." — **Josephus**, *Antiq.*, **18**, 8, 1.

received some illustration in a portion of the preceding sections. It is additionally illustrated by the fact, that the murder of body-guards, mentioned in one or two instances by historians, proceeded from princes of patrician politics.[109]

§ X. *Two Senatorial Usurpations.*

Among senatorial usurpations two claim special attention from the vantage which they afforded the aristocracy in contests with the prince and people. One of these occurred in A. D. 14, just before the accession of Tiberius. The other was six years later, during an effort to overthrow him. The success of the Senate in these two instances was partly due to an earlier plot whereby all advocates of popular rights had been driven out of it,[110] and partly due to that control which the reactionary residue had thenceforward exercised over Augustus, over legislation, and over the distribution of offices. Augus-

[109] "Galba's entry into the city of Rome, after the massacre of several thousands of unarmed soldiers, formed a disastrous omen of things to come." — **Tac.** *Hist.* **1**, 6, Bohn's trans. "Without a request, of his own free will, he could consign to the sword so many thousand innocent soldiers. My heart recoils with horror, when I reflect on the disastrous day on which he made his public entry into the city; and on that his only victory, when, after receiving the submission of the suppliant soldiers, he ordered the whole body to be decimated in the view of the people." — **Otho's Speech** in **Tac.**, *Hist.* **1**, 37, Bohn's trans.

At an earlier date Claudius had been concerned in a conspiracy against Caligula, one of whose murderers, Sabinus, committed suicide. Another, Chærea, as also Lupus, who had murdered Caligula's wife, were executed, probably as a concession to the popular party. The following extract blends their death, doubtless, with that of anti-patrician officers. Claudius extended amnesty to all (see, however, pages 75, 76), "only a few tribunes and centurions from those [?] who had conspired against Caius being excepted, not only for example's sake, but because he knew that they had DEMANDED HIS OWN DEATH ALSO." — **Suetonius**, *Claud.* c. 11. "Chærea, therefore, was led to death, and with him Lupus and A CONSIDERABLE NUMBER OF ROMANS." — **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **19**, 4, 5. "Claudius having taken out of the way every soldier whom he suspected." — **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **19**, 5, 1.

[110] See Ch. VII. § VIII.

tus but partially emancipated himself from it towards the close of his life.

1. In A. D. 14, when Tiberius became prince[111] or presiding officer of the Senate, he must have found civil and military offices mainly filled by partisans of the aristocracy, a portion of whom were plotting his overthrow. The *Comitia*, or popular assemblies, had, in the time of Augustus, been deprived of some, or, if Tacitus do not exaggerate, of nearly all power.[112] The Senate, while Augustus, at a distance from Rome, was on his death-bed, seized the moment to abolish these assemblies, so that no laws could be enacted, nor candidates elected, save by itself. An election was due.[113] The Senate took the matter into its own hands, ignoring utterly any popular electoral right.

Indignation or lack of opportunity prevented at first any nomination of anti-senatorial candidates. The popular party cannot have wished to recognize such an election. This feeling must, after a year's experience, have yielded to a desire of mitigating the evil which it could not cure. Opposing candidates were, in A. D. 15,

---

[111] See views of Tiberius touching the nature of his office in Appendix, Note G, foot-note 30 ; and compare in Note G the conclusion of § IV.

[112] Augustus, after defeating Antony, had deprived the provincial towns (Dio Cass. **51**, 2) of their popular assemblies. He, or the aristocracy in his name, gradually, during his reign, deprived the *Comitia*, or popular assemblies at Rome, if Tacitus (*An.* **1**, 15) can be credited, of everything but a shadow of their former power.

[113] Augustus died August 19, A. D. 14. Consular elections for the ensuing year were usually (Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 353, col. 1) in July. "The *Comitia* for elections took place every year at a certain period, though it depended ON THE SENATE AND THE CONSULS as to whether they wished the elections to take place earlier or later than usual. . . . The president at the *Comitia* was the same magistrate who convoked them, and this right was a privilege of the consuls, and in their absence of the prætors." — **Smith**, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 353, col. 1. It is plain from Tacitus (*An.* **1**, 81) that the consuls for A. D. 14 were elected before the accession of Tiberius. The Senate doubtless forbore to specify a day for, and the existing consuls, acting in the interest of the Senate, forbore to convoke, the *Comitia*, so that the people had no opportunity to vote.

put in nomination.[114] The position of Tiberius as presiding officer caused the nominations to pass through his hands.

After, or before the senatorial faction had rebelled against Tiberius, in A. D. 31, and had murdered many of the popular party, the *Comitia* must, in a limited shape, or otherwise, have been restored to the people.[115] Possi-

---

[114] Tacitus, as usual, cloaks senatorial misdeeds by attributing them to Tiberius, and (as elsewhere, see Appendix, Note G, foot-note 122) endeavors to convey by implication and pseudo-moralizing what he does not venture distinctly to assert. He in this instance wishes his reader to believe that TIBERIUS transferred the *Comitia* to the Senate, or, in other words, that he took the right of suffrage from his political friends, and bestowed it exclusively on his political enemies. Such a statement needs no refutation, but Tacitus refutes it (*An.* **1**, 81) by betraying that the consular election took place before the accession of Tiberius. These consuls could in A. D. 15, as their predecessors in A. D. 14, omit to convoke the popular *Comitia*. The two narratives are as follows: —

A. D. 14.

"The elections *Comitia* were then first transferred from the *Campus* [*Martius*, that is, from the people] to the Senate; for though the [preceding] prince had conducted all affairs of moment at his pleasure, yet, till that day, some were still transacted according to the inclination of the tribes. Neither did the regret of the people for the seizure of these their ancient rights rise higher than some impotent grumbling; the Senate, too, released from the charge of buying votes, and from the shame of begging them, willingly acquiesced in the regulation by which Tiberius contented himself with the recommendation (?) of four candidates only, to be accepted without opposition or canvassing." — **Tac.** *An.* **1**, 15, Bohn's trans. altered.

A. D. 15.

"Of the *Comitia* for the creation of consuls, which took place IN THE REIGN OF TIBERIUS FOR THE FIRST TIME IN THIS YEAR, and in each successive year, I hardly dare affirm anything, so different are the accounts about it. His general practice was to declare, 'that TO HIM NONE HAD SIGNIFIED THEIR PRETENSIONS BUT THOSE WHOSE NAMES HE HAD DELIVERED TO THE CONSULS; others, too, might do the same, if they had confidence in their interest or merits.' Sentiments plausible in terms; in substance, hollow and insidious; and the greater the semblance of liberty with which they were covered, the more remorseless the slavery in which they would issue." — **Tac.** *An.* **1**, 81, Bohn's trans.

[115] Under the year 32, **Dio Cassius** says, that Tiberius "sent them (the names of candidates) into the Senate . . . and afterwards those [who had been selected by the Senate] entering the assembly of centuries, or of

bly the Senate, after the death of Tiberius, again appropriated to themselves all electoral rights. The effort of Caligula towards restoring popular assemblies with their legislative and elective powers was no doubt a chief cause of his being assassinated.

2. In A. D. 18 and 19, the Senate had sent Germanicus, a nephew of Tiberius, into Syria and elsewhere,[116] to override his uncle's authority, and to manage matters in the interest of the patricians. The death of Germanicus, in A. D. 20, and the activity of Piso, the Emperor's lieutenant, baffled their schemes. They thereupon undertook to wreak their vengeance upon Piso. Charges were preferred against him which, according to Roman law and custom, should have been tried in a prætor's court. The Senate, by a usurpation of authority, brought the case before itself, and condemned him. This usurpation must have caused a fierce contest between the senatorial and popular parties, in which the efforts, probably strenuous ones, of Tiberius, must have been on the popular side and in behalf of Piso. Tacitus, with whom crimes in the interest of patricianism, at least when committed by the Senate, were things to be overlooked, omits any narrative of the struggle. He even omits direct mention of the fact. What he does is, to put into the mouth of Tiberius a speech containing an allusion to this illegal transfer of jurisdiction. The allusion is so worded as to convey the false impression that Tiberius had approved the transfer or deemed it a matter of small consequence.[117] The

---

tribes, in whichever their election belonged, were, because of ancient form, voted for, as in appearance, at least, is yet done."— Dio Cass. **58**, 20. Unless Dio copied the concluding remark inadvertently from some earlier writer, the form of popular election must have existed at the beginning of the third century.

[116] The authorization is placed by Tacitus (*An.* **2**, 43) in A. D. 17. Germanicus set out in A. D. 18. The concerted effort at rebellion took place in A. D. 19. See Ch. VIII. § 1.

[117] "We (?) have granted to Germanicus [that is, to his partisans] solely this extra-legal [advantage], that inquisition concerning his death should be made in the Senate-house rather than the forum ; before the Senate rather than before judges. Let other things be treated with LIKE MOD-

effort at rebellion will be more fully detailed hereafter.[118] The pretext for usurpation of jurisdiction is matter for conjecture.[119]

§ XI. *Herod Agrippa, Senior.*

The earlier history of Herod is elsewhere mentioned.[120] His mother had been an intimate friend of Antonia. He perhaps, because of this, had been preceptor for a short time to the grandson of Antonia, who was also grandson of Tiberius.[121] While thus engaged, Herod, as we may judge from his extravagant habits,[122] must have become a companion of the aristocracy, and perhaps of their plots. At a later date he visited Tiberius at Capreæ, probably as their emissary. He was put under arrest, but at Caligula's accession shared the amnesty granted by the latter. Some months later he headed a rebellion against Caligula. The story of Philo and his coadjutors, — copied by Josephus, — that the latter gave Herod a kingdom, is doubt-

---

ERATION. Let no one be influenced [against Piso] by the tears (!) of [my son] Drusus, nor by my grief, (!) nor yet [in favor of Piso] by fictions against us." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **3**, 12. This is one of the accustomed methods, copied or invented, by which Tacitus endeavors to render Tiberius responsible for the wrong-doings of his senatorial opponents.

[118] See Ch. VIII. § 1.

[119] The Senate which in A. D. 14 abrogated, by ignoring, the *Comitia*, may in A. D. 20 have treated the judicial power of these assemblies as transferred to itself. "The *Comitia Centuriata* were in the first place the highest court of appeal, . . . and in the second they had to try all offences committed against the state, . . . no case involving the life of a Roman citizen could be decided by any other court." — **Smith**, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 334, col. 2. Yet jurisdiction in Piso's case belonged properly (see note 117) to judges, — convened, as it would seem (**Tac.** *An.* **2**, 79), by a prætor; and only, perhaps, in the event of condemnation before such a court, could his case have been submitted to the *Comitia*.

[120] See pp. 99, 100.

[121] **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **17**, 6, 6.

[122] "He spent a great deal extravagantly in his daily way of living, and a great deal in the immoderate presents he made; . . . he was in a little time reduced to poverty, and could not live at Rome any longer. Tiberius also forbade the [such ?] friends of his deceased son to come into his sight." — **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **18**, 6, 1, Whiston's trans.

less a falsehood, originating with the conspirators, and intended to obscure their crimes. He must have been brought back from Alexandria to Rome as a prisoner, and cannot have seen Judæa until after Caligula's death.[123] Claudius, who was under senatorial control, gave to this worthless man a large kingdom at the expense, not of senatorial but of his own provinces, and, prompted no doubt by others, ratified publicly some compact with him.[124] The son of Herod was detained at Rome. The real object for this was doubtless that he might be a hostage within reach of the Senate to secure fidelity towards their interests from his unprincipled father. The need of security became evident afterwards.[125]

---

[123] Compare notes 104, 105, of Ch. VIII. and the text prefixed to them. Had Herod gone to Judæa as king during Caligula's reign, he would not have deferred until after that individual's death the hanging up in the temple of a gold chain *professedly* his gift. The imprisonment by Herod of Silas, his commander of cavalry (**Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19**, 7, 1), is attributed to his recollecting too clearly the imprisonment of Herod, at a date, perhaps, when the latter was trying to represent himself as endowed by Caligula with a kingdom. He may have shared an imprisonment of Herod under Caligula, but certainly not the one under Tiberius.

[124] Claudius "made a league with this Agrippa, confirmed by oaths, in the middle of the forum in the city of Rome." — **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19**, 5, 1, Whiston's trans.

[125] "As for the walls of Jerusalem, that were adjoining to the new city [Bezetha], he repaired them at the expense of the public, and built them wider in breadth and higher in altitude; and he had made them too strong for all human power to abolish, unless Marcus, the then president of Syria, had by letters informed Claudius Cæsar of what he was doing. And, when Claudius had some suspicion of attempts for innovation, he sent to Agrippa to leave off the building of those walls presently." — **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19**, 7, 2, Whiston's trans. "There came to him Antiochus, king of Commagene; Sampsigeramus, king of Emesa; and Cotys, who was king of the Lesser Armenia; and Polemo, who was king of Pontus; as also Herod, his brother, who was king of Chalcis. . . . While these kings stayed with him, Marcus, the president of Syria, came thither. . . . Marcus had a suspicion what the meaning could be of so great a friendship of these kings one with another, and did not think so close an agreement of so many potentates to be for the interest of the Romans. He therefore sent some of his domestics to every one of them,

Herod, of course, like others of his class, was attentive to outside pious observances, such as might enable his adherents to laud his religiousness.[126] He showed himself in matters of social and political life a thorough disciple of the Roman aristocracy.[127] His arrest of Peter and James is said (Acts **12**, 3) to have pleased the Jews, meaning, doubtless, the political conservatives. Fortunately for his countrymen his reign was brief.

§ XII. *Insincerity of Patrician Hobbies.*

Political parties rarely believe all that they profess. The patrician party at Rome was not only no exception to this, but a striking, if not at times an unblushing, illustration of it. Patrician contempt for Greek culture, or dislike for anything foreign, meant merely distaste for what the Senate did not legally control. The distaste disappeared if patrician interests could be thereby subserved. Any dress save the Roman might, in a period of patrician ascendency, meet dishonor from the leaders [128]

---

and enjoined them to go their ways home without further delay." — **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19**, 8, 1, Whiston's trans.

[126] Herod "was exactly careful in the observance of the [ceremonial] laws of his country, . . . nor did any day pass over his head without its appointed sacrifice." — **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19**, 7, 3, Whiston's trans.

[127] "He also showed his magnificence upon the theatre [at Berytus] in his great number of gladiators; and there it was that he exhibited the several antagonists, in order to please the spectators; no fewer, indeed, than seven hundred men to fight with seven hundred other men; and allotted all the malefactors he had for this exercise, that both the malefactors might receive their punishment, and that this operation of war might be a recreation in peace. And thus were these criminals all destroyed at once." — **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19**, 7, 5, Whiston's trans. These fourteen hundred men may have included some criminals, but the majority must have been persons politically distasteful to Herod and his party. Compare opposite views by Josephus on the morality of similar doings, in Ch. II. note 26.

[128] Augustus "gave orders to the ediles not to permit, in future, any Roman to be present in the forum or circus, unless they took off their short coats, and wore the toga." — **Suetonius,** *August.* c. 40, Bohn's trans.

of that party, and yet its leaders would at other times adopt foreign dress as a means of winning foreign favor.[129] The same voices that decried foreign customs and servile descent were prompt to uphold either of them which could be made subservient to patricianism, or to its ally, heathenism.[130] The same party which by trickery and violence expelled its opponents in B. C. 17 from the Senate, under pretext of purifying that body, subsequently introduced Gauls rather than Romans into it, if the former were more in sympathy with patricianism.[131] Roman

[129] According to **Tacitus** (*An.* **2**, 59), Germanicus adopted the Greek dress at Alexandria, as Scipio at an earlier date had done in Sicily. The former was engaged in a patrician rebellion against Tiberius, and the latter needed Greek help against the Carthaginians.

[130] "Considering it of extreme importance to preserve the Roman people pure, and untainted with a mixture of FOREIGN OR SERVILE blood, he [Augustus] not only bestowed the freedom of the city with a sparing hand, but laid some restriction upon the practice of manumitting slaves." — **Suetonius,** *August.* c. 40, Bohn's trans. "With regard to the religious ceremonies of foreign nations, he was a strict observer of those which had been established by Ancient Custom; but others he held in no esteem. For, having been initiated at Athens, and coming afterwards to hear a cause at Rome, relative to the privileges of the priests of the Attic Ceres, when some of the mysteries of their sacred rites were to be introduced in the pleadings, he dismissed those who sat upon the bench as judges with him, as well as the by-standers, and heard the argument upon those points himself. But, on the other hand, he not only declined, in his progress through Egypt, to go out of his way to pay a visit to Apis, but he likewise commended his grandson Caius for not paying his devotions at Jerusalem in his passage through Judæa." — **Suetonius,** *August.* 93, Bohn's trans. The things herein contemned were equally old as those commended.

Compare in Ch. VII. note 95, senatorial action whereby the priesthood of Vesta was opened to children of persons that had been slaves, for this must at that date, as we may infer from **Sueton.** *Claud.* 24, have been what was alone meant by children of freed persons.

[131] "By a decree of the fathers . . . the Æduans first obtained the privilege of admission into the Roman Senate, in consideration of their ancient confederacy with Rome, and because they alone of all the Gauls are entitled the brethren of the Roman people."—**Tacitus,** *An.* **11**, 25, Bohn's trans. This was in A. D. 48, during the reactionary reign of Claudius. The measure was opposed (**Tac.** *An.* **11**, 23) mainly, no doubt, by the

citizens who believed in monotheism or popular rights were ejected. Gauls who upheld heathenism and patrician privileges were, when it suited the senatorial party, introduced.

Judaism was the especial abhorrence of patricians. Yet their leader, Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, could fraternize with Herod and laud the Jewish temple; and they themselves not only fraternized with the Jewish rulers at Alexandria, but appointed as their head general an unprincipled Jew.

The charges of Unbelief seem to have originated exclusively with patricians; yet when their party came into power under Claudius, it acknowledged publicly through that emperor its utter ignorance of the religion which it was defending, and it summoned as teachers slaves from Etruria, who were supposed to know something on the subject. On slave testimony see Ch. VIII. note 118.

CHAPTER VI.

BELIEF OF ROME'S IMPENDING DESTRUCTION.

§ I. *As a Precedent of the New Era.*

We now come to another and singular evidence of Jewish influence, a belief, namely, of Rome's destruction, imparted by the conquered Jews to no small portion of their conquerors.

---

popular party. The prince, according to **Tacitus** (*An.* **11**, 24), paid no attention to the opposition, which means that the aristocracy who ruled him cared nothing for an argument against their interests. The Gallic aristocracy thus selected for senatorial privileges had no doubt common interests with that at Rome, and had perhaps been its ally in the conspiracy against Caligula. Romans were about the same time (**Dio Cass. 60**, 11, 29) expelled from the Senate on the charge of not being wealthy enough.

The Jews, instead of looking backward for a golden era, as was done by Greeks and Romans, anticipated theirs in the future. To them its chief feature was the universal righteousness, which they, unlike their heathen neighbors, deemed necessary to, and sure to occasion, universal prosperity. Some thought that Prophets, or a Prophet, gifted to turn the hearts of mankind toward their God, others, a few at least, that a Priest, and yet others that a King, would introduce the new era.[1] Each one's expectation was modified, doubtless, by his early education and by his personal character. The anticipation of a king gained in prominence after, if not prompted by, the subjection of Judæa to the Romans. He was expected, of course, to be raised up in the land of Monotheism, and would to Europe have been a King from the East.

Distinct from any belief in a blissful era, and yet closely associated with it in the Jewish mind, was a supposition that it would be introduced by a subjugation or thorough destruction of Rome. This view originated probably in B. C. 63, a year in which Pompey took Jerusalem and entered the Holy of Holies, and in which Asia Minor was shaken by earthquakes, — a proof, many Jews might think, of divine displeasure at Pompey's doings. Fuller details will be found in the chronological part of our narrative, under that year. At first we find merely a belief in the subjugation of Rome, that a king was about to be born for the Romans; but as feelings became embittered, the expectation of her thorough destruction became prevalent. Still later a partly miraculous position was assigned to the Roman Emperor as Beliar, or, to use a still later phraseology, as Antichrist.

---

[1] See mention of expected Prophets in the Sibylline Oracles, **3**, 780, quoted in Appendix, Note A, § II. Part E, and compare the question (**John 1**, 21), "Art thou that prophet?" The expectation of a Priest, held of course by ritualists, will be found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, **3** (Levi), 18, quoted in *Underworld Mission*, p. 49 n (3d edit. p. 47 n). The anticipation of a king is better known; see it in § II. No. 1, of this chapter.

That the Jews should cherish a belief in the downfall of their oppressor, is no more than has been done by other nations. That they should impose this belief on their conquerors, is what has been accomplished by none but themselves.[2]

Before proceeding we must attend to two different Jewish views. One was that mankind had Seven Ages given them for repentance, implying apparently a termination of earthly things at the close of that period; the other, that the world would last Ten Ages.[3] The former of these must, if we may judge from events in B. C. 17, have been then applied by the Jews in a somewhat altered form, to teach that Rome, in her unrepentance, would perish seven centuries after her foundation. The latter view was subsequently taught, and must have lasted for a century. In applying it to Rome the Jews phrased themselves that when the Tenth Age should come, that is, at its beginning, not at its end, Rome should

---

[2] I once laid aside a newspaper containing some account of a widow in Hindostan burning herself after her husband's death. The narrative said that she predicted, AS WAS CUSTOMARY on such occasions, the downfall of British rule. The paper has been lost, nor have I had means to verify the statement. If it be true, it implies an anticipation, interwoven with religious belief, somewhat analogous to that of the Jews under Roman rule. Such predictions have, however, found little credence among the English conquerors of Hindostan.

[3] For the belief in seven ages see Sibylline Oracles, **2**, 312, quoted in Appendix, Note A, § II. Part F. Compare Epistle of **Barnabas**, c. 15 (**13**, 9), "Putting an end to all things I will make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, of another world."

The belief in ten ages appears in the work usually called Second Esdras, but which in the Ethiopic version, here quoted, is termed the First Book of Esdras: "The world is distributed into ten periods. To the tenth is it arrived, and a half of that tenth remains." — **First Book of Esdras**, **14**, 9, Laurence's trans. (corresponding to 2 Esdras, **14**, 11, com. vers.). In the **Sibylline Oracles** (**8**, 199–205) we are told that "when the tenth generation shall be in Hades . . . [God] will render the earth a desert and there shall be a resurrection of the dead." See a different view in Ch. II. note 44.

perish, and in this shape it is copied by at least one Roman writer.[4]

Patricians in B. C. 17 originated a counter-forgery in the name of Sibylla, one object of which was, by stretching an age to one hundred and ten years, temporarily to parry or weaken the former of these views.[5] Possibly Jewish views on this subject circulated in the guise of "Etruscan Teaching," for under that head also we find antagonist efforts towards elongating an age and making it one hundred and eleven years.[6]

---

[4] See the Jewish view in § II. No. 4, of this chapter. In what I suppose to be part of the Erythræan Verses a statement now stands that when the tower of Babel fell, "then was the tenth generation of mortals since the flood came upon former men." — **Sibyl. Orac. 3,** 108, 109. (Compare **11** or **9,** 14.) These two lines are, I suspect, an interpolation by some later hand. The established reputation of the Erythræan document was thus used to support the idea that DURING the tenth generation a convulsion might be expected. See also Sibyl. Orac. **4,** 86.

The following is from a Heathen: "The ninth age is running its course and worse periods than the times of iron." — **Juvenal,** *Satire,* **13,** 28, 29. In **Dio Cassius, 57,** 18, and **62,** 18, the form of expression is that "when thrice three hundred years shall have passed," that is, at the beginning of the tenth age or century, Rome should perish. In both passages it appears as an utterance of Romans.

[5] See Appendix, Note A, § VI.

[6] Censorinus, in his work *De Die Natali,* c. 17, quotes from Valerius of Antium, Varro, and Livy, statements and facts supporting the position that an age, such as elapsed between age-games, was a hundred years. In the Epitome of **Livy,** Book **49,** is a passage, not the one quoted by Censorinus, which mentions games as "celebrated in the Centennial year."

Censorinus in the same work alleges evidence in support of the position that an age exceeded, or might exceed, one hundred years. After distinguishing natural from civic ages, he tells us "The Ritual Books of the Etruscans appear to teach the length of natural ages in any particular state. In these [books] it is said to be written that the beginning of the different ages can be thus determined. Among those born on the day when a city or state comes into existence, the longest lived finishes by the day of his death the measure of the first age, and of those remaining in the state on that day, the death of the longest lived finishes the

§ II. *Jewish Expectations.*

Jewish anticipations of Rome's destruction are scattered through the Sibylline Oracles and appear also in what is commonly called the Second Book of Esdras. They can also be inferred with much probability from the opinions of Jewish and semi-Jewish Christians. To Christians a distinct section will be devoted. In treating Jewish expectations we shall commence with those which are embodied in the Sibylline Oracles.

For convenience of reference the pieces are numbered, but the order in which they were written cannot in most cases be certainly determined.

No. 1.

This piece, in its present shape, belongs to the year B. C. 29 or 30.[7] Whether it existed with slight difference at an earlier date, is a question which at least deserves consideration.[8]

"But when Rome shall rule over Egypt also,
Uniting it to its empire, then shall the mightiest kingdom

---

second age. Thus successively the duration of the remaining ages is terminated. The portents moreover which admonish that each age is closed are divinely sent, because of human ignorance. The Etruscans, having diligently studied these portents in the light of their skill as augurs, committed them to books. So that in the Tuscan Histories — written, as Varro testifies, in their eighth age — there is given the number of ages granted to that race, the length of each of those which were already past and the prodigies which marked their close. It was written that the first four ages were of one hundred and five years, the fifth of one hundred twenty-three, the sixth of one hundred and nineteen, the seventh as many, the eighth was then in course, the ninth and tenth remained, at the close of which there would be AN END OF THE ETRUSCAN NAME." — **Censorinus**, *De Die Natali*, c. 17.

[7] The reduction of Egypt after the victory over Antony took place according to Dio Cassius (**51**, 17) in B. C. 30; according to Censorinus (*De Die Natali*, 21), in B. C. 29.

[8] Josephus (*Wars*, **1**, 19, 3) mentions an earthquake while the forces of Augustus and Antony confronted each other at Actium.

By reading "Judæa" instead of "Egypt also," Ἰουδαίας instead of καὶ

Of the Immortal King appear among men,
And a Sacred Prince shall come to hold the sceptre of the whole earth
To all ages of the time which approaches.
Then inexorable anger for Latin men,
A triumvirate shall destroy Rome by a miserable fate,
But all men shall be destroyed in their own chambers
When the fiery cataract shall stream from heaven.
Alas for wretched me when that day shall come,
And the judgment of the Immortal God, the Great King.
But at present go on building, O cities; ornament yourselves all
With temples and stadiums, market-places and gold images,
With silver and stone ones, that you may come to the bitter day."

Sibyl. Orac. 3, 46–59.

No. 2.

The following piece is found grouped with denunciatory prophecies over Gentile cities. There is no apparent clue as to its date.

"O self-confident Rome;—after the Macedonian phalanx
Thou wilt shine to Olympus; but God will make thee
Totally unheard of. When thou seemest to the eye

Αἰγύπτου, we should have, without altering the number of syllables, a date in the year B. C. 63. We must in this case, however, understand the "Three" who destroy Rome as an idea borrowed, not from the well-known Triumvirates, but from the following event in the civil war between Marius and Sylla.

In the year B. C. 87 the Consul Octavius of Sylla's party drove his colleague Cinna of the Marian faction out of the city. Cinna collected additional forces, and, contrary to the advice of Sertorius, consented that Marius, lately returned from exile, should join them. According to **Plutarch** (*Sertorius*, c. 5), "Cinna summoned Marius; and, his force being divided into three parts, the three [that is, himself, Marius, and Sertorius] acted as commanders." They marched against and captured the city, whose inhabitants were slaughtered and maltreated during five days and nights (**Dio Cass.** Vol. **1**, p. 110, ed. Sturz) by the immediate followers of Marius, many of whom were slaves. At last Sertorius, outraged at their brutality (**Plutarch**, *Sertorius*, c. 5), "speared all of them to the number of not less than four thousand, who had camped in one place."

According to **Cicero** (in *Catilinam*, **3**, 4, **4**, 1) and **Sallust** (*Catiline*, c. 47), there must have been an alleged Sibylline passage, extant in B. C. 63, which mentioned that three persons would take possession of Rome, and, as the connection would at least seem to imply, with destructive intent. Compare Ch. VII. note 9.

To sit firmest, then I will cry these things in thine ear: —
'Destroyed, thou shalt bewail thy brilliancy and marble.'"
Sibyl. Orac. 7, 108–112.

No. 3.

The earthquake mentioned in this, points out B. C. 63[9] as likely to have given occasion for it. The names of the cities mentioned by Eusebius in his Chronicon and by Tacitus (Annals, **2,** 47) as overthrown in A. D. 17, differ from the list here given.[10] The doings of Pompey and the extortions of Flaccus,[11] in B. C. 62, may account for the bitterness of tone.

"Again there shall occur the greatest portents among men.
The deep-whirling Tanais shall leave the Mæotic lake,
And in the deep stream shall be the track of the fruit-bearing furrow,
And the multiplied stream shall cover the neck [of land].
Chasms [shall be formed] and narrow rifts; and many cities
With their inhabitants shall fall; in Asia: Iassis,
Cebra, Pandonia, Colophon, Ephesus, Nicæa,
Antioch, Tanagra, Sinope, Smyrna, Marosune;
Of Europe: Scyagra, Clitus, Basilis, Meropæa,
Antigone, Magnesia, Mycene, Panthæa,
Gaza, the all-blessed, Hierapolis, Astypalæa.
Know then, Egypt's destructive race is near destruction;
And then, to the Alexandrines, the bygone year will be the better.[12]
Whatsoever Rome has received from tribute-paying Asia,
Thrice so much riches shall Asia receive again
From Rome, and shall repay deadly insult upon her.
AS MANY AS FROM ASIA HAVE WAITED UPON ITALIAN HOMES,
TWENTY TIMES SO MANY SHALL BE HIRELINGS IN ASIA,
Italians [who] shall serve in deepest poverty.
O tender, wealthy virgin, offspring of Latin Rome,[13]

---

[9] **Dio Cassius,** alluding to this, says: "The greatest earthquake happening of all that had ever taken place destroyed many of their cities." — Dio Cass. Vol. **1,** p. 292, ed. Sturz.

[10] The cities mentioned by **Eusebius** in his *Chronicon* as overthrown in A. D. 17 are Ephesus, Magnesia, Sardes, Mosthene, Ægæ, Hierocæsarea, Philadelphia, Tmolus, Temnus, Myrhina, Apollonia, Dia, Hyrcania.

[11] See in the next chapter under B. C. 62.

[12] Year is used for time, meaning that the Alexandrines had seen their best days.

[13] Virgin, offspring of Rome. This, in Jewish phraseology, means inhabitants of Rome. In the Old Testament we find Daughter of Zion,

Often intoxicated by being much sought for in nuptials,
A servant, — thou shalt not wed in the world,
And often thy mistress shall shear thy luxuriant hair.[13a]
Justice,[14] as ruler, will cast heaven-high things to the earth,
And again she gathers from the earth into heaven,
For mortals are subjected in life to suffering and injustice.
Samos shall be 'Sandheap,' Delos [the visible] shall be invisible,[15]
Rome shall be 'Ruin,' and all [heathen] oracles come to an end."[16]
Sibyl. Orac. 3, 337–364.

No. 4.

The question whether this extract makes any hostile mention of the Romans must depend on the sense attached to the word "people" in line 17. The mention of the tenth generation is hardly an interpolation, for it stands in connection with the subsequent lines. This renders probable that the piece is not earlier than A. D. 19. The period to which it seems most apposite is, for the first portion, A. D. 64, after the earthquakes in South Italy and the fire at Rome, and for the latter portion, A. D. 68, during the civil war, after Nero's death, in which Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian were rivals.

"But when on earth are earthquakes and violent thunderbolts,
Thunder and lightning and a mildewed land,
Rabidness of swift wolves and human slaughter,
Destruction of mortals and also of lowing cattle,
Of four-footed herds and patient asses,
Of goats and sheep; and thereupon the uncultivated ground
Shall in quantities become a desert through neglect,
And fruits shall fail, and freemen be sold as slaves

---

or of Jerusalem, used for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, 2 Kings, **19**, 21; Daughter of My People, for the Jews, Jer. **9**, 1; Daughter of Tyre, for the Tyrians, Ps. **45**, 12; Daughter of Babylon, for the Babylonians, Ps. **137**, 8; Daughter of the Chaldeans, for the inhabitants of Chaldæa, Is. **47**, 1, 5; Daughter of Edom, for the Edomites, Lam. **4**, 21; Daughter of Egypt, for the Egyptians, Jer. **46**, 11; Daughter of Zidon, for the Zidonians, Is. **23**, 12.

[13a] A sample of annoyances endured by slave-women.

[14] For Δίκην read Δίκη. [15] Delos was the chief slave-market.

[16] The concluding words are sometimes translated, "all [i. e. Sibylline] oracles will be fulfilled." The prior mention, however, of Delos, where Apollo was supposed to have his oracle, makes me deem the above translation more probable.

Among most mortals, and temples be robbed:
Then after these things shall the Tenth Generation appear
When the Sender of earthquakes and lightnings
Shall break the zeal for idols, and agitate [the] people[17]
Of seven-hilled Rome, and great wealth shall perish,
Consumed in a vast conflagration by Vulcan's flame.

And thereafter [shall be] bloody [drops] descending from heaven,[18]
. . . . . .[19]
But the whole world of countless men
Having gone mad shall destroy each other; and, amidst the confusion,
God shall send famines and pestilences and thunderbolts
Upon men who unjustly condemn rightful actions.
There shall be a failure of men on the whole earth,
So that whoever sees a man's track on the ground shall wonder.
Then once more shall the Great God who dwells in Heaven
Be everywhere the Preserver of practical-monotheists.[20]

---

[17] Λαόν, *people*. In Jewish phraseology this is used almost exclusively for "the Jews" (see Appendix, Note B, § I. No. 13). The writer may have had in mind a religious excitement among his own people at Rome, or, contrary to Jewish use, he may by "people" have meant the Gentile population of Rome. If so, he may either mean that God had startled them, or he may by mentally contrasting the "Senate" with its common adjunct, the "*Populus Romanus*," have used the Greek word λαός as a translation of *populus*, people. In this case he referred, not to a spasm of fright among Romans in general, but to a religious excitement among the common people as contrasted with the aristocracy.

[18] **Dio Cassius** (**51**, 17; **63**, 26) mentions bloody rain in the years B. C. 30 and A. D. 68. Touching the latter, he says that in one locality even streams of blood were the result, which means probably that some streams of water were more or less discolored by it. Light may be thrown on such an occurrence by the following extract: "The Neapolitans were rather shocked a few weeks ago to find their streets stained with red and their garments spotted with sanguinary-looking drops. A shower of red dust-specks had been drawn up by the wind from African deserts, and borne with it across the Mediterranean. This is not an unprecedented phenomenon. A shower of insects fell at Araches, in Savoy, last January, which, upon examination, proved to be of a species peculiar to Middle France; and a few years back Turin was visited by millions of larvæ of a fly found nowhere but in the island of Sardinia." — **Harper's Weekly**, June 5, 1869, p. 359.

[19] The absence of any verb from the preceding line renders it probable that something has been left out here.

[20] On the meaning of εὐσεβής, see Appendix, Note B, § I. 5.

And thereafter shall be deep peace and [sound] understanding,
And the fruitful earth shall again bear various fruits,
Not being divided [by hostile factions] nor enslaved.
But every harbor and roadstead shall be free to men,[21]
As it originally was, and shamelessness shall be destroyed."

Sibyl. Orac. 2, 6–33.

No. 5.

The year A. D. 70 seems among the most likely to have originated the present piece. Possibly the first two lines may allude to one of the vessels sent by Vespasian to provision the city.[22] It may have borne a purple or a gilded dragon's head for its beak, or have been fashioned, in some way, like a dragon.[23] If this surmise

---

[21] The civil war operated as a barrier to commerce. See an extract from Tacitus, *Hist.* **3**, 48, quoted in next note.

[22] Vespasian was in the East when he was proclaimed emperor. After a victory by the forces under one of his generals, we are told that Vespasian "proceeded with greater speed to Alexandria, that as Vitellius could no longer keep the field, he might distress the capital, dependent as it was on foreign supplies, by famine. With this view he also purposed by land and sea to invade Africa [i. e. Tunis and the adjacent country], which lay on the same side, in order to cause famine and dissensions by stopping the supplies of provisions." — **Tacitus**, *Hist.* **3**, 48, Bohn's trans.

Vitellius perished about the end of December, and there was therefore no longer any need of starving out the city of Rome; but we learn from Tacitus that "the city was plunged in grief, and perplexed with manifold apprehensions. . . . Because the ships were detained by the severity of the winter, the populace, who are accustomed to buy food from day to day, and concern themselves about the price of provisions, . . . believed that the coast was barred, and the transport of provisions prohibited." — **Tacitus**, *Hist.* **4**, 38, Bohn's trans.

Knowledge of this state of things must have been communicated to Vespasian, for we again learn from Tacitus that he "then committed to the still tempestuous sea some of the swiftest of his ships, laden with corn; and well it was he did, for the city was then tottering under a state of things so critical that the corn in the granaries was sufficient for no more than ten days' supply, when the stores from Vespasian came in to their aid." — **Tacitus**, *Hist.* **4**, 52, Bohn's trans.

[23] The dragon was afterwards, if not in A. D. 70, a common military standard for each cohort, as the eagle was for a legion. See Smith,

be correct, the piece probably belongs to the early part of A. D. 70.

"When a seemingly flame-colored dragon shall traverse the waters,
Bearing abundance within it, and shall nourish thy children
During famine and civil war,
The end of the world is near, and the last day,
And to the called and proven vindication from the Immortal God.
But first there shall be inexorable anger for the Romans,
A bloodthirsty time and a miserable life shall come.
Alas, alas for you, Italian land, great and barbarous nation,
You understand not, that, whence you came naked and unworthy
To the light of the sun, to the same region
Shall you go naked, and finally shall come to judgment
As having judged unjustly;
You alone with your giant-hands over the whole earth.
Falling from your height, you shall dwell under the earth.
Through naphtha, asphalt, and sulphur, and much fire
Shall you be made to vanish, and shall be ashes, eternally
Burning. And whoever looks shall hear lamentable
Bellowing from the Underworld, and a great gnashing of teeth,
And a beating of your atheist breasts with your hands.
[24]
. . . . . .
Adorn yourselves with images of gold and silver
And jewelled ones, that you may come to the bitter day.
Contemplate your first punishment, O Rome, and your howling.
No longer under your slave-yoke shall a neck be placed
By Syrian, or Greek, or Barbarian, or any other nation.
You shall be utterly plundered, and suffer reprisals for your deeds.
Wailing, you shall give till you have paid back all,
And be a subject of triumph to the world and disgraced before all."

Sibyl. Orac. 8, 88–130.

No. 6.

These lines stand at present in close sequence on the foregoing. Uncertainty as to whether they originally belonged to them induces me to assign them a distinct heading.

Dict. of Antiq, p. 1044, b. From the identification of the Roman power with a flame-colored — or, perhaps, a gold-colored — dragon by the author of the Apocalypse (Rev. **12**, 3), who wrote at about this date, I surmise that it was already an emblem of Roman authority.

[24] The omitted lines 107–122 dilate on the equality of all in Hades. They may either belong to the present piece or to some other production which the Byzantine Harmonist (see Appendix, Note A, foot-note 123) wished to collate.

"And thenceforward the sixth[25] generation of Latin kings,
Will fill out [their] allotted[26] life and will give up the sceptres."
Sibyl. Orac. 8, 131 – 132.

No. 7.

The following is found amidst various denunciations of Gentile cities and lands, collated perhaps by the Byzantine Harmonist. What pertains to Judæa may have been written between A. D. 65 and A. D. 70, whilst the Roman armies were in that country. What applies to Rome is apposite enough to the same period. Both pieces may originally have constituted different parts of one and the same effusion, though this is not certain.

"Spare, O Father of all, the productive region, the fruitful,
Great Judæa, that we may deliver thy decrees;
For thou hast recognized it by thy favors as the chief,
That it may appear to all mortals thy darling,
And may itself notice how bountiful God has been to it.
. . . . .
Italy, thrice wretched thou shalt remain a total desert, unwept,
A murderous serpent, in the fruitful earth, to be thoroughly exterminated." **Sibyl. Orac. 5,** 328 – 332, 342, 343.

No. 8.

The following piece belongs probably to the time of Hadrian. The writer, however, must have ignored, or overlooked, the fact that Egypt became a Roman province after the time of Julius Cæsar, who, doubtless, was reckoned as one of the fifteen kings.[27] Under No. 9, the identification of Hadrian as the fifteenth king is obvious.

"As it is decreed, — In the course of time,
When thrice five kings shall have ruled Egypt

---

[25] The sixth king means Vespasian (see the Jewish or Oriental method of counting in the Appendix, Note E), but the plural phraseology implies that the writer mentally associated Titus with him.

[26] The omission of one letter, so as to read *ὑστάτον* for *ὑστάτιον*, might permit the translation, "fill out extreme life," that is, the concluding term of mankind's existence.

[27] If we adopt the method of counting emperors which drops out Galba, Otho, and Vitellius (see Appendix, Note E), the piece would belong to the time of Commodus; but its contents do not agree with such a date.

And [the time] arrive of the five-century Phœnix,
A race shall come that it may plunder 'The People,'[28]
A nation [to plunder] the unscattered tribes of Hebrews.[29]
Warriors shall plunder warriors. Mars shall destroy the boasting Roman threats.
The once flourishing government of Rome is destroyed,
Of Rome, the former queen over neighboring cities.
No longer shall the army of luxurious Rome be victorious.
When the Conqueror from Asia shall come with his host,
And shutting in these [forces ?], shall enter the city.
Thrice three hundred and forty-eight
Years shalt thou fulfil, when there shall come on thee
Evil fate, overpowering thee and fulfilling thy name.[30]
"Alas for me miserable, when I shall see that day
Of thine, O Rome, and of all the Latins.
Jest if thou wilt at him, with his hidden spears,
From Asia, who is mounting the Trojan chariot,
Whose mind is furious. But when he shall have pierced the Isthmus,[31]
Watching around, — attacking all, — leaving the sea behind him, —

---

[28] The original is corrupted; for *πορθήσων* read *πορθήσον*, and for λαῶν read λαόν or else the Attic form λεῶν. The Hebrew parallelism of the passage will become more visible by arranging the Greek in accordance with the above translation, without reference to metre, thus: —

"Ηξει πορθήσον λαόν γένος,
Ἄκριτα φῦλα Ἑβραίων ἔθνος.

[29] "Unscattered tribes," — that is, the residents of Palestine who held Hadrian's armies for a time at bay. Or, we may translate "uncondemned tribes," that is, the innocent Jews everywhere, who, with no wrong proved against them, were the subjects of attack.

[30] In Greek the letters of the word "Rome" would, if used as numerals, add up 948. The year 948 from the founding of the city would be three years after the death of Commodus, or A. D. 195; but since the city was, by popular apprehension, treated as nine hundred years old in A. D. 19 and again in A. D. 64, it is conceivable enough that a Sibylline writer, between A. D. 130 and A. D. 150, should treat it as nine hundred and forty-eight years old.

[31] An allusion to Nero, whose return was expected to precede the Messiah's coming. See § V. and Appendix, Note F. Nero during his lifetime had undertaken to cut through the Isthmus of Corinth, and the writer seems to assume that on his return from the East — whither he was supposed to have fled, and where he was expected to reappear — the work would be perfected.

Then dark blood shall mark the track of the Beast.
But a dog[32] chased the lion which throttled the Shepherds.
His sceptre shall be taken away and he shall descend into Hades.
. . . . .
And then a Holy Prince shall hold the sceptre of the whole earth
To all ages, having wakened the departed.

Sibyl. Orac. 8, 137–159, 169, 170.

No. 9.

This also was written under Hadrian: —

"But when thou hast had thrice five luxurious kings
Enslaving the world from the East to the West,
[Your] king will be white-helmeted, having nearly[33] the name of a sea,
[Perambulating] with polluted foot to see the world, offering gifts,
Having superabundance of gold, and collecting yet more silver
From his enemies. And in nudity[34] he will lay bare,
And participate in, all secrets of magic sanctuaries.
He displays a boy as God. He will undo all sacred things,
And from the beginning will open the secrets of error[35] to all.
Thenceforward a wretched time when the wretched one[36] shall perish,
And the populace will say, 'Thy great power, O city, will fall,'
Knowing the evil day immediately at hand.
And then they shall wail together, foreseeing thy
Most wretched fate, both fathers and young children.
They shall wail out, 'Alas, alas!' by the sorrowful banks of the Tiber.

---

[32] A dog, i. e. the despised Jewish people, the lion being the Roman power.

[33] Or, "having the name of a neighboring sea," that is, the Adriatic.

[34] In the Leyden edition of **Orosius**, A. D. 1738, on page 489, is a copy from a coin or medal in the Pisan collection, *medallione qui inter numismata Pisana invenitur*, which represents Hadrian approaching a temple in a state of nudity, leading with his right hand a lamb and holding in his left a knife, perhaps a sacrificial one. Fire burns on an altar near by. The inscription COS. III, meaning third time Consul, implies that it belongs to A. D. 119, some years prior to Hadrian's initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries. Compare p. 325.

[35] Error is here, not improbably, used in the sense of Heathenism.

[36] Hadrian belonged to the ÆLIAN family. The Greek for this word and for WRETCHED is almost identical. In Book **5** there is appended to the mention of Hadrian three lines of commendation (48–50) by a Christian hand, which contrast strongly with the present and other Jewish manifestations of feeling or opinion.

After him three shall reign, occupying the very last time, 65
Filling out the name of the Heavenly God,
Whose power is now and shall always be."

Sibyl. Orac. 8, 50–67.

No. 10.

We will now turn to a work which in the Apocrypha of our English Bibles is called the **Second** Book of **Esdras.**[37] It is a Jewish one written during, or immediately after, the Jewish rebellion under Hadrian, that is, between the years A. D. 130 and 140.[38] The wri-

---

[37] The Second Book of Ezra, or Esdras, sometimes called the Fourth Book, no longer exists in its original language, which was probably Hellenistical Greek. Three early translations of it, however, into Latin, Æthiopic, and Arabic, are extant, all of which have obviously been made from the Greek. These three have been re-translated into English. The re-translation from the Latin is that which is printed in the Apocrypha of our English Bibles, though with the addition, from some different Latin text, of two chapters at the beginning and two at the end. The re-translations from the Arabic and the Latin will be found printed parallel to each other in an appendix to the fourth volume of Whiston's Primitive Christianity. The Æthiopic has been re-translated into Latin and also into English by Laurence, who published the same with the Æthiopic text in a volume entitled *Primi Ezræ Libri Versio Æthiopica.* In the Æthiopic and Arabic versions the work is styled the First Book of Ezra. In both these versions the first two and last two chapters of what is published in our English Apocrypha (chapters **1**, **2**, and **15**, **16**) are wanting, and the same chapters were also found by Laurence to be wanting in twelve out of the thirteen Latin manuscripts of the work which he was able to discover. There can be no doubt, therefore, that they form no part of the original work. On the other hand, both these versions contain a passage of some length, which, by accident or design, has been dropped out of the Latin copies. In the Æthiopic version it is numbered as chapter **6**, and belongs in the Latin copy between verses 35 and 36 of chapter **7**. For the evidence of these two statements the reader can consult in the work of Laurence above referred to, pp. 282–294, edition of 1820.

There can be no doubt that the work is Jewish. The name of Jesus, in chapter **7**, 28 of the Latin version, is an interpolation unsupported by the Arabic or Æthiopic.

[38] The allegory by Esdras concerning the Eagle with twelve wings in

ter's mind was exercised on the unhappy condition of the Jewish people, and the supremacy of the Gentiles. According to the Æthiopic version of his work, his angel instructor tells him, "Behold the time shall arrive, when the signs which I have foretold thee shall be seen; when the city [Rome] shall be concealed which now appears, and when the Land [the technical Jewish term for Judæa] shall appear, which is now concealed, when every one who is delivered from the evils predicted shall behold my glory.

---

ch. **11** is explained in the next chapter to mean twelve emperors, the second of whom is, by his long reign, clearly enough indicated as Augustus. If we count, as included in the series, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, it would expire with Domitian, at the close of the first century. If we omit them (see Appendix, Note E), it would expire with Hadrian. Their omission would be natural if the author were an Asiatic Jew, or wrote chiefly for Asiatics. The terrible position of the Jews under Hadrian would seem also more fitted to elicit portions of the production, than their condition under Domitian. Thus in ch. **10**, 32–34 (Lat. vers. **10**, 22) the writer states: "Our priests are burnt and our Levites led into captivity; . . . our virgins are slain and our wives suffer violence; . . . our righteous men are carried off and our young men reduced to servitude." In the time of Domitian, Judaism was, according to Juvenal, swelling its ranks with converts; and the comparison which Pliny, *Junior*, institutes between its suppers and those of Trajan implies, shortly after Domitian's reign, a respect on the part of many for the character of its entertainments. The book on which we are commenting seems inapposite to such a period.

In what is regarded as an addition to the work there is a passage (**15**, 46–63) indicating Asiatic origin, and another (**16**, 68–73), hereafter to be quoted, indicating that the addition also was made, in all probability, with reference to the troubles under Hadrian.

Again: the description, **3**, 14 (Lat. vers. **5**, 9), and **4**, 27 (Lat. ver. **6**, 24), hereafter quoted in Ch. X. note 134, is very expressive of the war under Hadrian, but does not seem applicable to the time of Domitian.

The following passages should, however, be duly considered before adjudging the work to Hadrian's time.

In ch. **1**, 1 (Lat. vers. **3**, 1), the writer speaks of his vision as occurring while he was [visiting?] in Babylon [that is, Rome], in the thirtieth year after Jerusalem's destruction. The writer elsewhere (ch. **9**, 42, 43; **10**, 48; Lat. vers. **9**, 43–45; **10**, 45, 46) uses thirty, apparently, as an indefi-

"For my Messiah shall be revealed with those who are with him; and cause [during the millennium ?] them to rejoice, who shall be raised up. After which my child, my Messiah shall die,[39] and all men who are alive; and the world shall be turned into its ancient state of silence for seven days, as formerly, so that no man shall remain. But after seven days it shall be awakened. And the perishable world shall wholly disappear; the earth shall give up the bodies that are deposited in it, and afterward shall they restore the souls that have been committed to them. In that day shall the Most High appear on the seat of judgment. His mercy [to his people ?] shall come. His clemency [to his enemies] shall cease and his long suffering have an end. Judgment shall alone remain."[40]

---

nite number. If we understand it literally, the date of the production would be the third year of Trajan, A. D. 100. Trajan, accordingly as we omit, or count, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, was the eleventh, or the fourteenth emperor, so that this supposition seems inadmissible.

In ch. **11**, 23, 24 (Lat. vers. **11**, 21), according to the Æthiopic and Vulgate, some — according to the Arabic, one — aimed at imperial power, but did not reign. If we adopt the former reading and understand it as meaning some of the twelve, it could only be understood of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, and would favor the date under Domitian. If some outside of the twelve be meant, it would favor the date under Hadrian. The loss of the original Greek leaves to us merely the understanding, or misunderstanding, of translators. This should not too readily be taken against evidence less likely to be essentially mistranslated.

The large head (ch. **11**, 35; Lat. vers. **11**, 31), which eats the smaller heads, or wings, or feathers, — for the versions vary, —if interpreted of an emperor putting out of his way heads of the aristocracy, would be applicable to Domitian or Hadrian, but more readily to the latter. The remnant of Domitian's reign after his contest with the aristocracy was too brief to have called forth this work.

[39] This conception that the Messiah, at the close of his reign, should die, appears both in the Æthiopic and Latin versions, but not in the Arabic. It accords with the view which Justin (*Dialog.* c. 49, *Opp.* p. 268 A) puts into the mouth of the Jew Trypho, that the Messiah was to be a human being.

[40] Laurence's translation of **Ezra** (or **2 Esdras**), ch. **5**, 26–38. Compare Lat. vers. ch. **7**, 26–34.

In the above the allusion to the destruction of Rome is only found if we adopt the Æthiopic text.

Another passage, however, contains, according to any of the three versions now extant, a plain affirmation of Rome's downfall as a precedent of the Messiah's coming. Ezra (ch. **11**, 1–39; Lat. vers. **11**, 1–35) sees an Eagle, obviously an emblem of the Roman Empire, and explained to be such in a subsequent chapter of his work. "The Eagle flew with his wings to reign over the earth and over them who dwelt therein, that he might render all things under heaven subject to himself. Nor was there any who opposed him, no not one." Afterwards (**11**, 41; Lat. vers. **11**, 37) Ezra hears a Lion's roar whose voice resembles a man's. It is the Lion of the tribe of Judah, or the Messiah, who thus addresses the Eagle: "Hear thou and I will speak to thee. To thee thus says the Most High: 'Art not thou the last of the four beasts whom I made to reign over the world, that by them the ends of the times might arrive? The fourth which is to come to subdue all the beasts that were before him, and to oppress the world and them with great trouble and affliction. Inhabiting the world for so long a period, inhabiting it with deceit, thou hast not judged it in truth. For thou hast oppressed the righteous; injuriously treated the meek, hated the upright, and loved liars; hast destroyed the strongholds of the righteous, and removed the walls of them who have not injured thee. Thy crimes have ascended to the Most High, and thy pride to the Almighty; who has contemplated his [creature] man. And behold the consummation and end of the world has arrived. Therefore, O Eagle, thou shalt surely perish; thy wicked wings, thy impious heads; thy malicious talons, and iniquitous body; that the earth may be at rest, relieved from any affliction, being relieved from thee; and that she may hope for the judgment and mercy of him who made her.'"[41]

In the following chapter an angel explains to Ezra the

[41] Laurence's translation of **Ezra** (or **2 Esdras**), ch. **11**, 42–53 (Lat. vers. ch. **11**, 38–46).

meaning of what he had seen: "With respect to the Lion which thou sawest rising up out of the field, roaring and speaking to the Eagle and rebuking him for all his crimes; the interpretation of what thou hast heard is, that this is the seed of David whom the Most High has kept to the latter days. This is he who shall come, and coming shall tell them of their sins and reprove them for their iniquities. He shall fully display to them their wilful proceedings, having previously placed them before his judgment seat alive. And when he shall rebuke them then shall they be utterly destroyed. As to the remainder of 'THE PEOPLE,' them will I redeem in mercy, those who have been saved in my [first] judgment [at the beginning of the millennium] and he [that is, the Messiah] shall make them joyful until [after the millennium] the day of [second] judgment arrives, of which I have spoken to thee from the beginning."[42]

Additional extracts containing Jewish expectations of Rome's destruction will be given hereafter. One, based upon Caligula's alleged performances, will be found when we come to § V. Others connected with Nero's return will be found in Note F of the Appendix.

§ III. *Roman Apprehensions.*

Almost every nation contains persons of desponding dispositions, who, in times of disaster, fear the national downfall. As the present, however, is a work upon Judaism, we are only in so far concerned with Roman apprehensions as they may have originated with, or been stimulated by, Jews. In the chronological chapters of our work, we shall find reason to suspect, or believe in, such Jewish origin, or stimulus, while examining the years B. C. 63, 49, 44, 17; A. D. 19, 41, 52, 64, and perhaps other periods.

There are, however, two passages of **Horace** which can,

---

[42] Laurence's translation of **Ezra** (or **2 Esdras**), ch. **12**, 36–41 (Lat. vers. ch. **12**, 31–34).

perhaps, be as conveniently considered in the present as in any other connection. The first of these was written in B. C. 27, whilst the Sibylline passage numbered 1, in the preceding section, was PROBABLY yet in circulation. The words of Horace are found in an ode addressed to Augustus: "Whom of the gods shall the people call to [aid] the perishing empire? With what prayer shall the Sacred Virgins weary Vesta, too inattentive to their hymns?"[43]

The other is from the sixteenth Epode, which concludes by imitating and burlesquing Jewish Sibylline Verses.[44] This leaves little doubt that Horace laid the popular despondency, in part at least, at the door of the Jews. His reference to Roman despondency is as follows:—

"The soil will again be occupied by wild beasts. The Barbarian cavalry, alas, will stand victorious on the ashes and tread with sounding hoof the city. . . . No determination is better than this, to go; as the Phocians fled . . . whithersoever our feet may carry us. . . . This is my decision. Can any one advise better? Why do we delay our auspicious embarkation? But [first] let us swear to the following: 'When stones float . . . it shall not be impious to return.'"[45]

In the Appendix, Note A, § VI., attention will be called to the Centennial Ode, or Age Song, of Horace, written for the celebration in B. C. 17. In the present connection it is noteworthy that he therein restricts his promise of future dominion for Rome to the narrow limits of Italy.

The reader, moreover, will, by returning to No. 9 of the preceding section, find attributed to the Roman populace a belief that destruction hung over the city.

§ IV. *Views of Jewish and Semi-Jewish Christians.*

Among Christians the belief of Rome's impending destruction was confined apparently to the Jewish and

---

[43] Horace, *Odes*, **1**, 2, 25-28.

[44] See Appendix, Note A, foot-note **71**.

[45] Horace, *Epode* **16**, lines 10-26.

semi-Jewish classes. Of the former class we shall have occasion to speak whilst considering the Apocalypse in the time of Vespasian. From the latter class two extracts will be found below;[46] others will be given in the Appendix under § III. of Note F.

Gibbon ignores the existence of the foregoing belief among Jews and Romans. He treats it exclusively as Christian, and apparently as restricted to no particular class of Christians.[47]

---

[46] "There is another and greater necessity of praying for . . . stability of the empire . . . to us who know that the great destruction impending over the whole world and therewith the close of this age threatening dreadful sufferings (*accrbitates*) are retarded by prolongation *commeatu* of the Roman Empire."— **Tertull.** *Apol.* c. 32. Compare c. 39; *ad Scap.* 2; *de Orat.* 5.

"All nations will be in arms, . . . of which havoc and confusion this will be the cause, that the Roman name by which the world is now governed (the mind dreads to say it, but I will say it because it will occur) shall be destroyed from the earth, and supreme authority shall return to Asia. The East shall again rule and the West be subservient. . . . The Sibyls say openly that Rome shall perish and indeed by the judgment of God, because she hated his name and being an enemy to justice destroyed [a] people, the foster-child of truth." —**Lactant.** *Div. Inst.* **7**, 15.

[47] "Whilst the happiness and glory of a temporal reign were promised to the disciples of Christ, the most dreadful calamities were denounced against an unbelieving world. The edification of the new Jerusalem was to advance by equal steps [?] with the destruction of the mystic Babylon; and as long as the emperors who reigned before Constantine persisted in the profession of idolatry, the epithet of Babylon was applied to the city and to the empire of Rome. A regular series was prepared of all the moral and physical evils which can afflict a flourishing nation; intestine discord, and the invasion of the fiercest barbarians from the unknown regions of the North [?]; pestilence and famine, comets and eclipses, earthquakes and inundations. All these were only so many preparatory and alarming signs of the great catastrophe of Rome, when the country of the Scipios and Cæsars should be consumed by a flame from heaven, and the city of the seven hills, with her palaces, her temples, and her triumphal arches, should be buried in a vast lake of fire and brimstone. . . . . The Christian who founded his belief much less on the fallacious arguments of reason than on the authority of tradition and the interpretation of scripture . . . . considered every disaster that

§ v. *The Roman Emperor as Beliar. Origin of the Conception called Antichrist.*

At some date between the death of Caligula in A. D. 41, and the expulsion of the Jews by Claudius in A. D. 52, an idea was added to the belief of Rome's destruction, namely, that its then reigning emperor, Claudius, should, as the head of Heathenism, set himself up against the Deity and be destroyed, and that his destruction should precede the new era. To the emperor, in this partly supernatural capacity, the title of Beliar[48] was appropriated. Nero, at a later date, superseded all recollection of Claudius as the expected individual, and, in place of the term Beliar, that of Antichrist[49] came into use, probably because of anticipated conflict between him and the expected, or re-expected, Christ.

The circumstances which gave rise to this conception were as follows. The Jewish aristocracy at Alexandria had, during a violent illness of Caligula, made themselves the tools of patrician leaders at Rome in a rebellion

---

happened to the empire as an infallible symptom of an expiring world." — **Gibbon**, *Rome*, ch. **15**. "Second Cause"; Vol. **2**, pp. 84, 85; edit. of 1816, Philada.

[48] A son of Belial means a child of wickedness, or of Heathenism; for in the Jewish mind the two ideas were associated. In the following passage of Paul: "What participation is there between righteousness and LAW-lessness; . . . what harmony has Christ with Beliar." — **2 Cor. 6**, 14-15. Beliar (common version, Belial) seems used for the impersonation of heathenism. Compare in Ascension of Isaiah, **4**, 2 (quoted in Appendix, Note F, § III.) the term Berial.

[49] The epistles of John, written probably between A. D. 64 and A. D. 80, though they use the term Antichrist in a metaphorical sense for any, or many, opponents, yet assume in their readers a prior knowledge of Antichrist as of an individual personage. "It is the last hour, and as ye have heard that [in the last hour] Antichrist is to come, already many antichrists have come into existence, whence we recognize that it is the last hour." — **1 John 2**, 18. "Many deceivers have appeared [literally, have come into the world] who do not confess that Jesus Christ has corporally [that is, actually] come. Such a one is 'The Deceiver,' and 'The Antichrist.'" — **2 John**, verse 7. Compare 1 John **2**, 22; **4**, 3.

against him. This must have disgusted the Jewish commonalty who knew patricianism as their most unscrupulous opponent. The accession to power of this patrician element under Claudius may have restored political authority to its Jewish allies, but could not free them from popular odium. To mitigate, or parry, this odium they invented and circulated the most extravagant stories of self-deification by Caligula, and of his having intended placing his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem. The result renders probable that they endeavored to obtain credence by representing the head of the Roman Empire as by his position the enemy of God. During their efforts measures were in progress at Rome for limiting Judaism and re-establishing worship of the Pagan deities. When these measures culminated by expulsion of the Jews, we can discern among the latter a belief which had been developed, that Claudius, as special enemy of the Deity, was to be destroyed, and that thereupon the new era would be introduced.

The following production, by its allusion to Agrippina, bears evidence that it was written between A. D. 49 and A. D. 54. We shall find in the chronological part of our narrative abundant reason for placing it about A. D. 52. The opening lines are based upon actions of Caligula, though stated in such a way as to give them a partly miraculous appearance. Possibly some Jews may have credited already the misrepresentations which both the Jewish and Roman aristocracy circulated concerning that emperor, but it is more probable that such credence originated at a later date.

"From THE RACE OF CÆSARS[50] at last shall Beliar come
And shall create[51] high mountains and still the sea,[52]

---

[50] More literally, but less expressively, "from the Augusti."

[51] There is but one and the same word in the original, *στήσει*, for the three translations, "create," "still," and, more doubtfully, "place." In the last instance it may mean "quiet the dead," and may refer to the attention manifested by Caligula, promptly after his accession (**Sueton.** *Calig.* 15) towards the ashes of his mother and brother.

[52] By Caligula "moles were thrown into a deep and rough sea, and

Shall create a big flaming sun, and brilliant moon,[53]
And place [?] the dead, and do many wonders
Before men, yet permanent things shall not be in him,
But deceitful ones, and he shall mislead many mortals,
Both faithful and chosen Hebrews and others LAW-less
Men, who have never yet hearkened to the word of God,
But when the threats of the great God shall draw near,
And flaming power pour in a flood upon the earth,
It shall burn Beliar, and the proud men
All, as many as have put their trust in him.
At that time, by the wiles of a wife shall the world
Be governed, and obey her in all things,[54]

---

rocks of the hardest flint were cut away and fields raised to mountains by filling, and mountain-tops levelled by digging, and, indeed, with incredible celerity, since delay was capitally punished." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 37. The concluding remark is no doubt false. What precedes it is at least extravagant exaggeration. According to the same writer in c. 19, and to Dio Cassius, **59**, 17, he made a bridge of boats, or vessels, two or three (?) miles long, across the Bay of Baiæ, — an indentation on the north side of the Bay of Naples, — and rode across it on horseback and in a chariot. The placidity of the sea while the bridge was being fastened together prompted him to remark (Dio Cass. **59**, 17) that NEPTUNE WAS AFRAID OF HIM.

[53] After Caligula crossed the bridge with his companions "they feasted during the remainder of the day and the whole night with much [artificial] light in the spot itself, and much illuminating them from the mountains, for the locality being MOON-SHAPED [a semicircle of hills around a semicircular bay], fire was visible on all sides, as in a theatre, so that there was no perceptible darkness ; for he wished to turn night into day as elsewhere sea into land." — **Dio Cassius, 59**, 17. Some of the feasters may have likened the illumination to the moon. Others may have alleged that it surpassed the moon and equalled the creation of sunlight.

[54] "From this moment [when Claudius married Agrippina] the city assumed a different character, and a woman had the control of everything. . . . The despotism exercised was as strict as though it were under the direction of a man ; in her public conduct she was grave and rigid, frequently haughty and overbearing ; . . . while an insatiable thirst for money was veiled under the pretext of its uses in maintaining the imperial authority. . . . [After Caractacus was brought prisoner to Rome] the people were summoned to see him as a rare spectacle, and the prætorian bands stood under arms in the field before the camp. Then first the servants and followers of the British king moved in procession, . . .

But when she shall be a widowed ruler over the whole earth,
And shall cast her gold and silver into the great sea
And the brass and iron [ornaments ?] of short-lived mortals
Into the deep, then shall all the elements
Of the world be widowed,[55] when God who dwells in Ether
Shall roll up the heaven as a book is rolled up[56]
And the whole diversified heaven shall fall on the earth and sea
And an inexhaustible cataract of raging flame shall pour out,
Which shall burn the earth and burn the sea
And melt the heavenly revolution, and days [consequent thereon]
And creation's self into one mass and refine it to purity.
No longer shall there be spheres of rejoicing luminaries
Nor night nor morning, nor multiplied days of care,
Nor spring, nor summer, nor winter, nor autumn,
Then shall the judgment of the Great God be manifested,
[The judgment] of that great age when all these things are to take place."[57]

In Ch. VIII. § v. will be found a fuller account of events in A. D. 52 – 54, which accompanied, or contributed to, the first public manifestation of belief in this conception. Its connection with Nero will be found in the Appendix, Note F, §§ II. III., in the former of which a quotation from Sibyl. Orac. **5**, 34, should be noted. The conception of Antichrist has lasted to the present day.[58]

---

and last himself, attracting the gaze of all. . . . The prisoners, released from their chains, did homage to Agrippina also, who, at a short distance, occupied another throne, in full view of the assembly, with the same expressions of praise and gratitude as they had employed to the emperor. A spectacle this, strange and unauthorized by the customs of our ancestors, for a woman to preside over the Roman ensigns. . . . Agrippina also began to assert her preëminence more studiously, and even to enter the Capitol in a chariot, a distinction . . . of old allowed to none but the priests and things sacred. . . ." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **12**, 7, 36, 37, 42, Bohn's trans.

[55] The same word which means widowed means also desolated, or laid waste.

[56] Books anciently were in the form of a scroll, opened by unrolling and closed by rolling up.

[57] **Sibylline Oracles, 3,** 63 - 92.

[58] "Some have maintained the opinion that Anti-christ will be Satan incarnate, but the more recent theologians reject this opinion as absurd, and hold that he will merely be under a high degree of diabolic influence.

CHAPTER VII.

CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE, B. C. 76 – A. D. 19.

In the second century before the Christian era, Greeks influenced by Judaism must, and Jews may, have existed at Rome, but any evidence of a direct influence by the latter on Romans is uncertain.[1] Our earliest reliable evidence of such influence is during the year B. C. 76, at which date the following narrative begins.

There are three epochs in the chronology of our subject which will each demand a chapter. During the first of these, B. C. 76 to A. D. 19, no law forbade conversions to Judaism. The second period extends from A. D. 19, when fearful penalties were enacted against such conversions, to the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. The third epoch extends from this latter date to the close of the war under Hadrian, which isolated the Jews of Europe and ended, apparently, their direct influence on heathens. Some subsequent events will appear in Ch. XII.

§ 1. *B. C.* 76. *The Erythræan Verses cause Discussion of Monotheism.*

The managers of the senatorial faction had, since B. C. 461, created and nourished a superstitious reverence at Rome for books, which they kept secreted in their own charge, and which subsequently to B. C. 76, if not previously, were attributed to a real or imaginary woman

---

The period of the sway of Antichrist, it is supposed, will continue for three and one half years from the time when his power has reached its acme, after which he will be destroyed by an extraordinary interposition of the Almighty, a short time before the end of the world." — **New Am. Cyclopædia**, Vol. **1**, p. 654, col. 1.

[1] See action by the Prætor for Foreigners in B. C. 139 against worshippers of Sabazian Jove (Jupiter Sabaoth?) mentioned in Ch. VIII. note 27.

named Sibylla. These writings had perished in B. C. 83, in the burning Capitol. A Jew or monotheist at the present date took advantage of reverence for them and turned the tables on the patricians. He induced the Senate to bring from Erythræ in Asia Minor leaves in Greek verse, alleged to be of the same authorship, which were deposited in the senatorial archives. These leaves formed a connected composition which in unmistakable terms taught monotheism and other Jewish views.[2] The recognition of this work by the Senate as on the same footing with the former, from which no appeal was permissible, could not but prompt questions concerning the divine nature. An evidence of its doing so is that Cicero, writing thirty years afterwards "*On the Nature of the Gods*," selects disputants who could only have met in this, or in part of the preceding, year.[3] Either he deemed the year appropriate, or, more probably, he but filled out a conversation which had really taken place.

The Senate must have acted with little or no scrutiny of this document,—written in a foreign language,—which subsequently proved so sore a thorn in their sides. Sixty years later stringent measures were taken to prevent its perusal.

---

[2] See account of this document in Appendix, Note A, § II.

[3] Cotta, one of the speakers, died in B. C. 74 or 73. He and Cicero were never conjointly in the city after B. C. 76. Previously to this year Cicero had been in Greece and Asia, whither he went after his first entrance as a young man upon public life, and whence he did not return until some time in B. C. 77. **Ramsay**, in *Smith's Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **1**, p. 738, col. 2, regards the *De Natura Deorum* as published in B. C. 44, and the implied date of the conversation as "somewhere about the year B. C. 76." On the same page, the same writer says: "In no production do we more admire the vigorous understanding and varied learning of our author." Possibly the collision of Jewish with heathen views had caused thorough debate on the subject in the Roman community. Among difficulties which the Jews must have encountered was, that men, who had never thought of life save in connection with a physical body, could not readily comprehend an incorporeal God. One of Cicero's speakers alleges (*De Nat. Deor.* **1**, 12, al. 30) that such a God "must necessarily be destitute of perception, sagacity, pleasure."

§ II. *B. C.* 75–63. *Other Sibylline Verses. King from the East.*

The reception of the above verses showed that Jewish teachings in the name of Sibylla would command a respectful hearing, or a superstitious reverence, from the Romans. Consequently other Jews committed their teachings to verse and ascribed them to the same authoress. Among these teachings is one of uncertain date which the reader will find in the Appendix, Note A, footnote 96. I suspect it to have been written during, or prior to, the year B. C. 63. If so, it will aid in explaining the heathen allusions, which we shall shortly meet, to an expected "King for the Romans" and "King from the East." The reader should also in this connection reexamine, under § II. of the preceding chapter, the piece numbered 1, which may with slight variation have existed as early as B. C. 63. Both these pieces differ from the Erythræan verses, by substituting a King for the Prophets of God.

In the year B. C. 63, Pompey laid siege, during three months, to the temple at Jerusalem, and, after its capture, horrified its votaries by entering the Holy of Holies. This last procedure took place in the third month, which, as the Jewish year began near the equinox, means probably in June, or early in July.[4] A tribute, which he imposed, did not diminish Jewish indignation. During this siege, or directly after its close, a fearful earthquake shook all Asia Minor,[5] and was felt even at Rome.[6] The Jews were

---

[4] Josephus, *Antiq.* **14**, 4, 3.

[5] See Ch. VI. note 9. This earthquake took place not long before the death of Mithridates, whose demise, according to **Plutarch** (*Pompey*, c. 41), was announced by special messenger to Pompey while on an expedition into Arabia Petræa. Judæa had, according to the same writer (*Pompey*, c. 39), been ALREADY subdued and reduced to the condition of a Roman province. This order of events seems more reliable than that of Dio Cassius who makes the Arabian expedition precede that into Judæa.

[6] Cicero, *De Divinatione*, **1**, (11), 18.

not unlikely to interpret it as a sign of God's displeasure at the insult to his temple.[7] A Messianic excitement

---

[7] A Sibylline piece is still extant, which seems to have been prompted by the above events. It stands in immediate sequence upon the piece (**3**, 652–662, quoted in Appendix, Note A, foot-note 96) concerning a King from the East. Whether the two constituted originally but one piece, or whether the following lines were afterwards subjoined, may be a question.

"But again the Gentile kings against this Land
Shall rush in force, bringing calamity on themselves.
For the temple of the Great God and most eminent men
Shall they wish to seize. When they enter the Land
The polluted kings shall sacrifice around the city,
Having each his throne and a disobedient People.
. . . . .
The all-producing earth shall be shaken in those days
By the Immortal hand, and the fish in the deep
And all the wild beasts of the earth and countless tribes of birds
And all souls of men and the whole sea
Shall shudder under the Immortal look, and fright shall exist.
. . . . .
All the well-made walls of evil-minded men
Shall fall to the ground, because they recognized not the Law
Nor the Judgment of the Great God. But with senseless mind
Rushing, ye all raised spears against the temple.
And God shall judge all by war and the sword,
By fire and flooding rain. There shall be
Sulphur from heaven, stones and hail,
Frequent and destructive, and quadrupeds shall perish.
And then they shall recognize the Imperishable God, whose judgments these are.
Lamentation and battle-cry over earth's expanse
Shall come from perishing men. They shall lie speechless,
Bathed in blood. Earth shall drink
The blood of the perishing: wild beasts be satiated with their flesh.
The Great Eternal God himself told me
To prophesy these things. They shall not be unfinished
Nor unfulfilled; since IT alone placed them in my mind,
The Spirit of God [which] is without deception in the world."

Sibyl. Orac. 3, 663–701.

In the foregoing the term "kings" seems to mean leaders or generals. The disobedient people may mean those Jews who had called in the Romans. The allusion to war would favor the supposition that it was written during the siege of the temple, whilst Mithridates, the dreaded

among them would, under the circumstances, be natural. The Romans, moreover, were in the midst of alarm from Catiline's conspiracy and from events which Cicero has deemed worthy of record as supposed portents.[8] They were not likely therefore to be less susceptible than usual to the infection of any such excitement.

During, or immediately after, the above-mentioned Eastern events a report became current at Rome of which we have two versions; one, that a king was about to be born for the Roman people, another, that he was to be born for the whole world. It must have attracted much attention, since in the midst of Catiline's conspiracy it occasioned talk in the Senate. That body, being apparently in a jocose mood, passed a decree that no one born that year should be brought up. The decree was not registered, being regarded doubtless as a mere piece of Senatorial merriment. Marathus, however, a freedman of Augustus, whose account is copied by Suetonius,[9] treats it as sober earnest. It must have been passed in the latter part of August or the beginning of September, for on the 23d of the latter month it was still fresh enough to be the occasion of an additional witticism. On that day Augus-

---

opponent of the Romans, was yet in arms. This date is further favored by the absence of any allusion to Pompey's entering the Holy of Holies. The lines (702 sqq.) which follow the above extract might, at first sight, appear to be connected with them, but a close inspection will probably lead to an opposite conclusion. See part of them quoted in Note A of the Appendix, in the text prefixed to foot-note 70.

[8] **Cicero** committed to verse his mention of comets, a total eclipse of the moon in a starry night, a citizen killed by lightning when the sky was clear, an earthquake, and some other supposed prodigies. See *De Divinatione*, **1**, (11), 18.

[9] "**Julius Marathus** is authority [for the statement] that, a few months before Augustus was born, there occurred at Rome a public prodigy, by which notice was given that Nature was in labor with a king for the Roman people; and that the frightened Senate enacted that no one born that year should be brought up; but that those amongst them, whose wives were pregnant, hoping each that it pertained to him, took care that the decree of the Senate should not be registered in the treasury." — **Suetonius**, *Augustus*, c. 94.

tus was born, and the Senate was engaged with business touching the Catiline conspiracy. The father of Augustus was delayed at home by the advent of his son. When the cause of the delay became known, Nigidius,[10] one of the Senators, remarked, humorously no doubt, that a lord was born to the whole earth.[11] The father of Augustus, if we may take the statement of Dio Cassius,[12] without his inferences, must have joined in the jest by suggesting the propriety of killing his new-born son, from which his friend, in like spirit it would seem, restrained him.

The only natural explanation of the prevalent belief in a coming king for the Romans and for the whole world

---

[10] **P. Nigidius Figulus** was "a Pythagorean philosopher, . . . so celebrated on account of his knowledge, that Gellius does not hesitate to pronounce him, next to Varro, the most learned of the Romans. Mathematical and physical investigations appear to have occupied a large share of his attention. . . . He . . . took an active part in the civil war on the side of Pompey; was compelled in consequence by Cæsar to live abroad, and died in exile B. C. 44." — **Smith,** *Dict. of Biog. Art. Figulus.*

[11] "On the day when Augustus was born, the fact that the Senate was occupied upon Catiline's conspiracy, and that Octavius came late, in consequence of his wife's confinement, gave notoriety to the event, that Publius Nigidius, hearing the occasion of his delay, and the hour of his wife's delivery, declared that a lord was born for the world." — **Suetonius,** *Augustus*, c. 94.

[12] "When the boy [Augustus] was born, Nigidius Figulus, a Senator, immediately predicted for him the sole monarchy. This [man] excelled those of his own time in his laying off the Heavens, and knew thoroughly the value of the stars, what their import was singly, and what when mingling with each other in clusters, or when opposed to each other by given intervals; and on this account he has been charged with the cultivation of forbidden arts. This man asked Octavius, when he met him coming late to the assembly, on account of the birth of his son, — for there happened to be a meeting of the Senate that day, — why he had delayed; and, learning the cause, cried out, 'You have begotten a lord for us,' and then restrained him [Octavius], — who was troubled at this and wished to destroy his child, — by saying that it was impossible that such a child should suffer any such thing. These things were spoken of at that time." — **Dio Cass. 45,** 1, Vol. **2,** p. 286 (Reim. pp. 419, 420).

is the supposition that it originated in a Messianic excitement among the Jews. There is no heathen source to which we can with plausibility attribute it. The prophets of evil, mentioned by Cicero,[13] may either have been excited Jews or heathens.

§ III. *B. C.* 62–50. *Conflict of Parties and Religious Ideas. Cicero a Reactionist.*

The aristocracy, after their victory over Catiline, which, in some points, was a victory also over the common people, undertook to reward their partisans. Flaccus, one of their active assistants, was appointed, for the year B. C. 62, to the province of Asia.[14] Here he succeeded in filling his own pockets — and probably those of a good many satellites — at the expense of the unfortunate inhabitants. One of his proceedings was to seize, as already mentioned,[15] all the gifts intended for the temple at Jerusalem. Cicero, in the year B. C. 59, defended him by saying that this gold was duly weighed and paid into the treasury,[16] meaning apparently the provincial one. This defence implied that if the gold were to be repaid, it should be at expense of the provincial treasury. He forgot to add that Flaccus, by the pretence of fitting out a fleet and by other expedients, had known how to transfer the money again from the treasury to his own pockets, or those of his favorites.

A brother of Cicero, named Quintus, was the successor of Flaccus and retained the position for three consecutive years, B. C. 61–59. He was a Stoic, not afraid to advocate some Jewish views,[17] and was much more acceptable to the provincials[18] than to the aristocracy at home,

---

[13] "Prophets, with inspired breast, poured forth through the land many predictions which threatened grievous misfortunes." — **Cicero,** *De Divinat.* **1,** (11), 18.

[14] Asia means a portion of Asia Minor.

[15] See Ch. II. foot-note 32.

[16] **Cicero,** *Pro Flacco,* c. 28.

[17] See Appendix, Note A, foot-note 96.

[18] **Cicero,** who had aristocratic prejudices, writes to **Quintus,** two years after he had been in Asia, that self-restraint "was always very easy

who deemed it their special perquisite to plunder the provinces. It is probable that his appointment and retention in office were partly, at least, due to Jewish influence at Rome.

More indubitable evidence of this influence on Roman politics will be found in the already-mentioned speech of **Cicero.** He says: "Next in order is that odium [caused by the seizure] of Jewish gold. . . . You know what a band there is of them, with what concord it acts, HOW MUCH IT CAN ACCOMPLISH IN [OUR] ASSEMBLIES. I will lower my voice so that only the judges can hear. For there are not wanting some who would incite them against me and against every prominent [or perhaps excellent] man; whom I will not assist so as to make it easier for them."[19] This may be the language of irony, but, whether so or not, we must suppose that the Jews, though without office, had political influence; else the language would have been ridiculous.

The following from the same connection indicates popular regard and reverence for their religion: "Cneius Pom-

---

to you. . . . When you resist, as you do, money, pleasure, the desire of all things [whatever], . . . the Greeks will regard you as one of ancient times, or even think you a divine man descended from heaven into the province. . . . What can there be so excellent and desirable as that . . . wherever you come there is public and private joy, since the city seems to have received a guard, not a tyrant; the home a guest, not a plunderer?" — **Cicero,** *Epist. ad Fratrem.* **1,** 1, Vol. **3,** pp. 530, 531, Lemaire's edit. Quintus, however, had a sturdily honest, plain-spoken freedman, **Statius,** who aided him greatly. That a former slave should have a decision in important matters and a distribution of favors was galling to the aristocracy. Cicero remonstrated against it in his own name (p. 536), states in another letter that he did so, not of his own judgment, but as a means of acquainting Quintus with the talk of others (*Epist.* **2,** p. 552), and then reiterates his former remonstrance, and adds, that all objections to Quintus were based on his freedman (p. 553). The reader must not infer that disgust at the elevation of a freedman prevented applications to him for office. Cicero writes: "How many, do you think, have applied to me for recommendation to Statius?" — *Epist. ad Fratrem.* **1,** 2, p. 553.

[19] **Cicero,** *Pro Flacco,* c. 28.

pey, after the capture of Jerusalem, though a victor, touched nothing [to take it away] from that temple. . . . I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT [RESPECT FOR] THE RELIGION OF JEWS, and enemies, prevented that most worthy commander, but his own moderation."[20] Cicero would hardly have defended Pompey against suspicion of showing reverence to the Jewish religion, unless such reverence had been common enough, even among the wealthier classes, to justify the idea that Pompey might be infected with it.

Still another passage implies that Jewish writings, or Jewish teachings, must have been sufficiently known to point the sarcasm which it contains. The Jews claimed that they were the especial favorites of heaven. Cicero must have had this in mind while saying: "How dear [that race] may be to the immortal gods is taught by their being conquered, expatriated, enslaved."[21] He had in a previous sentence remarked: "Religious reverence for what they hold sacred, *istorum religio sacrorum*, is repugnant to the glory of this [our] empire, to the dignity of our name."[22] These expressions indicate a feeling widely removed from indifference, such as prevailed towards any religion save the Jewish. They imply a struggle against Judaism and misgivings touching the result.

Cicero had unblushingly defended, and the Senate had unscrupulously acquitted, a wrong-doer because he was their political comrade. The community lost patience, and a reaction followed. One item of the reaction was Cicero's banishment, in B. C. 58. Another item was the abolition, in the same year, of an existing edict against the Egyptian worship.[22a] This meant that religions were not to be exclusively under patrician control.

Some years later, about B. C. 54–51, **Cicero** wrote his *De Republica*, a work intended for the defence of old customs and patrician privileges. When he wrote it, Jewish teaching must already have been familiar, not merely to the common classes, but to the intelligent, for Cicero

---

[20] Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, c. 28.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.*

[22a] See Appendix, Note H, foot-note 2.

in the sixth book not only perverts Jewish phraseology and the Jewish idea of judgment by teaching that devotion to the state was the highest form of piety and that heavenly rewards awaited such as showed this devotion,[23] but he uses terms of which there can scarcely be a doubt that they were technical among monotheists.

---

[23] The sixth book of the *Republic* contains, in imitation of a somewhat similar fiction by Plato, a document called *Scipio's Dream*. It is extant both in Greek and Latin, and in either shape probably proceeded from Cicero. The Greek terms are certainly the originals, and must have been in his mind when penning the Latin ones. The document can be found in Lemaire's edition of Cicero, *Opp. Philos.* Vol. **5**; the Latin (*De Republica*, **6**, 6–19) on pp. 372–394, and the Greek (cc. 2–9) on pp. 407–415. The document mentions (p. 408) a Supreme Being, ἄρχοντι θεῷ, who administers the universe, διοικοῦντι τὸν κόσμον; calls the universe (p. 409) his temple; (compare Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, **5**, 75); regards the body (*Ibid.*) as a prison (compare extracts from Clement of Alexandria and Arnobius in *Underworld Mission*, Note E of the Appendix); connects (*Ibid.*) the terms δικαιοσύνη and εὐσέβεια, which, in Jewish phraseology, mean righteousness and practical monotheism, and mentions (p. 408) τόπον ὡρισμένον, the "Allotted Place," a term technical among semi-Jewish Christians (see Barnabas and Irenæus, cited in *Underworld Mission*, p. 123; 3d edit. p. 118), and probably, therefore, among Jews, as a place for righteous souls. It represents (p. 410) that the Deity dwells in, or is identified with, the sphere of the fixed stars, that is, the highest heaven, and mentions (pp. 386, 412) periodical deluges and conflagrations which must occur at their ὡρισμένον χρόνον, appointed time. Part of these views may be borrowed at second-hand from disciples of the Jews.

The verses from Erythræ represented the care of Æneas for his parent and child as a practical recognition of God. **Cicero**, intentionally no doubt, misdefines εὐσέβεια (p. 409, or, in his translation, pp. 377, 378, piety) as meaning devotion to a parent or relative, and therefore in its highest form, as being devotion to the state. He lays down with the emphasis of Orthodoxy, "YOU MUST BELIEVE as follows: 'To all who have . . . ENLARGED their country the attainment is made known of the Allotted Place in heaven, where the blessed enjoy an endless age.'" — Page 408. Scipio's (adoptive) father and grandfather are held up to him (p. 409) as models of this piety. He himself (Scipio *Africanus Minor;* No. 21 in Smith's *Dict. of Biog.*) had changed the annual prayer for ENLARGEMENT into one for PRESERVATION of the country. Was his murder — like that of Sejanus — due to Patricians? "The opposite party (**Dio Cass.** Vol. **1**, p. 86, edit. Sturz) took no pleasure in it."

§ IV. *B. C.* 49. *Romans throw away Idol Images during the Passover.*

We now come to an annual custom, mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, which must have lasted a number of years, but whose origin and termination we have no means of accurately determining. Judging from the degree of calendrical derangement[24] implied in the statement of Dionysius, he[25] or his informant must have witnessed the ceremony about B. C. 49. It consisted in a procession of Roman dignitaries, both civil and ecclesiastical, on the first day of the Jewish Passover, to a sacred bridge over the Tiber, whence they threw into the stream thirty images, — representative doubtless of idols, — calling them Greeks, or Grecian.[26] The words of **Dionysius**

[24] When Cæsar regulated the calendar in B. C. 49, he inserted eighty extra days into that year, in order that its termination might agree with the now established computation. At the date to which Dionysius alludes, the equinox must have occurred between the 1st and 14th of May, — a discrepancy from present reckoning of not less than forty-two, nor more than fifty-six, days. The variation, therefore, from our calendar was less by between twenty-four and thirty-eight days than it was in B. C. 46. As, however, the difference between a lunar and a solar year is about eleven days, there would have been about three years requisite between the date to which Dionysius alludes, and the year B. C. 46, for the increase of variation. This would carry us back to B. C. 49. Any error in assuming this date will not exceed a twelvemonth.

[25] Dionysius settled at Rome about B. C. 30. He may have visited there in B. C. 49, or his informant may have witnessed the ceremony in that year.

[26] Judaism had spread chiefly in countries where the language was Greek. The term "Greek," or "Grecian," became, therefore, to the Jews, a synonyme for Gentile, or idolatrous. Thus **Paul**, in writing to his brethren, not in Greece, but at Rome, uses the term "Greek" (Rom. **1**, 16; **2**, 9; **3**, 9; **10**, 12) as the antithesis for Jew. It seems to have the same meaning in Acts **19**, 10; **20**, 21; 1 Cor. **10**, 32; **12**, 13; Galat. **3**, 28; Coloss. **3**, 11. Jerome (Vol. **8**, p. 700 C) translates "Gentiles" where the Chronicon of Eusebius reads "Greeks." In the Sibylline Oracles the same use, if not indubitable, is more than probable, as in the following: —

> "Greeks [Gentiles?] shall again fight each other;
> Assyrians and Arabians and quiver-bearing Medes,

are: "This the Romans continued until my time to perform a little after the spring equinox in the month of May, on what are called the Ides, for they wished it to be the MIDDLE DAY[27] of the month. On this day the chief priests who are called pontiffs, having made sacrifices according to the laws and being accompanied by the virgins who guard the perpetual fire and by the prætors and such other citizens as can lawfully attend the sacred rites, throw (threw ?) images, in human form, thirty in number, from the sacred bridge into the river Tiber, calling them 'Greeks.' But as regards the sacrifices and other sacred rites which Rome performs according to Grecian, OR ITS OWN LOCAL CUSTOMS, we will elsewhere treat."[28]

There can be scarcely a doubt that the custom originated in some Sibylline admonition to throw away idols, in which case it cannot date further back than B. C. 76. The foolish explanation — not his own — which Dionysius has prefixed to his narrative,[29] shows that when he

---

Persians and Sicilians, and the Lydians will revolt,
[As also the] Thracians and Bithynians and dwellers by the Nile."
Sibyl. Orac. 11, 173-176.

"Fifteen centuries have passed
Since Greeks [Gentiles ?] were ruled by proud kings,
Who initiated the chief crime for mortals,
The many images of perishing gods for those who go to ruin."
Sibyl. Orac. 3, 551-554.

See also Book **3**, 545, 564. In the former of which lines I notice that Alexandre, the French editor of these Oracles, understands "Greece" as meaning heathendom in general.

In the caption of two works sometimes attributed to Justin Martyr, — *Oratio ad Græcos* and *Cohortatio ad Græcos*, — and in that of Tatian's work, *Adversus Græcos*, the term "Greeks" is evidently used for Gentiles.

[27] The Jewish Passover began on the 15th of that month whose commencement, or new moon, was nearest to the spring equinox. The MIDDLE DAY of the Roman lunar month must necessarily have been the 15th. The shorter months had a middle day, and the longer ones had not.

[28] **Dionysius Halicarnass. 1**, 38, Vol. **1**, p. 97. Cp. Ch. IV. n. 13.

[29] "IT IS SAID that the ancients offered human sacrifices to Saturn, — a kind of sacrifices used at Carthage during its existence and among Gauls to this day, and among some others of the Western nations. But Hercules,

published his work, in B. C. 7, there can have been but few persons who recollected the first procession of this kind. The conservative party would naturally feel very sore at the remembrance of it. Yet any attempt to explain it away must have proved difficult, if this were the most successful. The concluding remark of Dionysius evinces that the custom was well known NOT TO BE A ROMAN ONE. He himself cannot have credited the explanation which he quotes, and may have meant it as a piece of dry humor. Had the custom been of heathen origin, one tithe of the antiquity which he attributes to it would have placed it among the honored ancestral observances for the continuance of which the conservative party were sticklers.

As Cæsar became Pontifex Maximus in B. C. 63,[30] and was killed in B. C. 44, the ceremony must have existed in his official term and with his sanction. Whether he ever headed the procession is a point on which we have no historical statement.

Under the year B. C. 49, Dio Cassius enumerates several

---

wishing to abolish such a sacrificial custom, consecrated the altar on the hill of Saturn, and originated the burning of sacred [or irreproachable] incense in a PURE fire, and, that men might have no anxiety at despising their national customs, he taught the inhabitants, as a means of mollifying the divine anger, that, in place of the men, whom, after binding them hand and foot, they were in the habit of throwing into the Tiber, they should make human images adorned after the same fashion and throw them into the stream." — **Dionys. Halicar. 1,** 38, Vol. 1, pp. 95, 96.

It will be noticed that incense was to be offered on the HILL OF SATURN, and that no distinct mention is made of its being offered to Saturn. Three hundred years before the Erythræan verses Saturn seems to have been practically ignored by the Romans. Half a century after their composition Italy was supposed, ON AUTHORITY OF THE SIBYLLINE VERSES, to have been SACRED to him. See on this subject, Appendix, Note A, § II. Part C, especially foot-note 49. Augustus, and the conservatives in B. C. 17, ignored Saturn, who must for some reason have been distasteful to patricians.

[30] **Dio Cassius, 37,** 37. The law of Sylla was, after a struggle, repealed, and that of Domitius, which gave the election to the people, revived. One object of this was, doubtless, to effect Cæsar's election.

supposed portents, including repeated earthquakes and a total eclipse of the sun,[31] which seem to have prompted, as usual, Sibylline predictions.[32] The civil war between Cæsar and Pompey was about commencing, and the partisans of Pompey endeavored to conciliate the Jews by a series of favors, which shows that their influence, at least in Asia Minor, was deemed important.[33]

§ v. *B. C.* 44. *Cæsar's Death. Cicero disavows Heathenism.*

In this year Cæsar was assassinated, and at his funeral pyre the Jews were conspicuous.[34] The attachment of their body, or of its major part, to Cæsar is explicable on the ground that he was the popular leader, and that their chief affinities were with the popular party. He had, however, in early life, sought in Asia Minor a refuge from Sylla, and was likely enough, while there, if he had not already done it, to unlearn some religious errors of his

---

[31] **Dio Cass. 41,** 14.

[32] "Certain oracles were sung as being by Sibylla, and certain inspired persons made frequent predictions."—**Dio Cass. 41,** 14.

[33] **Josephus,** in his *Antiquities*, **14,** 10, 13–19, has collected some of these decrees made during the consulship of Lentulus and Marcellus, B. C. 42. The reader of Josephus must to some extent invert his order, if it is to be made chronological. The decrees of Dolabella, which Josephus gives previously to the above, were, in fact, five years later. Of the decrees in B. C. 49, or which Josephus seems to place in that year, one (§ 13) exempts Asiatic Jews from military service; four (§§ 14, 16, 18, 19) exempt, or dismiss, from military service Jews, of different localities [even those], who were Roman citizens; one (§ 17) authorizes the Jews of Sardis [even? if they were], Roman citizens, to settle their disputes at their own tribunals; and one (§ 15) directs the magistrates of Cos, in accordance with some decree of the [Roman?] Senate, to transmit safely home certain individuals. Six additional decrees (§§ 20–25) in favor of the Jews MAY belong to this same year, but Josephus has not furnished means in each case of determining the date.

[34] "A multitude of foreign nations . . . gave vent to grief, each in its own fashion; but especially the Jews, who even frequented the funeral pyre during *continuis* consecutive (or whole) nights."—**Suetonius,** *Cæsar*, c. 84.

country.[35] Moreover, if he did not learn to regulate his own life by monotheistic rules, he may have acquired truer ideas of human rights and human civilization. These were likely to be strengthened rather than impeded by his political position.

The Gallic population at Rome had been, during many years before Cæsar's time, a steady ally of the popular party. His campaigns in Gaul, even if directed against their aristocracies, may have wounded the pride of Gauls in Italy and alienated many of them from himself, and if so, he may have deemed this an additional motive for keeping, or increasing, by political favors,[36] any good-will which the Jews owed him either as the popular leader, or as the opponent of Pompey, who had profaned their temple.

It may be a question whether Cæsar openly countenanced or not the proposed application to himself of a Sibylline passage,[37] which referred to the Deity. If he did, his action was likely to shock reverential — by which must not be understood the most zealous — Jews even more than the passage disquieted his political opponents.

After Cæsar's assassination, Antony, then consul, was left temporarily as leader for the popular, or, to speak more exactly, the anti-patrician, party. He first opposed and afterwards bought over Dolabella. The two made a

---

[35] Cicero may have written from purely political motives, yet he professes that his own eyes were partly opened, or his doubts confirmed, by comparing notes with a king from Asia Minor. His words are: "I think that the law concerning augurs, although it was originally established because of a belief in divination, yet has afterwards been preserved and retained for political reasons, *reipublicæ causa*. . . . Let us examine auguries of foreign nations which are not so much *artificiosa* a matter of study [in the sense of artifice?] as of superstition. . . . Deiotarus used to inquire our rules of augury from me, I theirs from him. Immortal gods, what a difference! How antagonistic, even, some of them were!" — **Cicero**, *De Divinat.* **2**, (35, 36), 75, 76. Whether Cicero here uses *artificiosa* in a bad sense may be a question. Compare *De Divinat.* **1**, (18), 34; **2**, (11), 26, on its meaning.

[36] **Josephus**, in his *Antiquities* (**14**, 10, 2–8), has made a collection of seven decrees by Cæsar in favor of the Jews.

[37] See Appendix, Note A, § III. foot-note 99.

bid for Jewish favor.[38] Antagonism to Cæsar's murderers may have predisposed many Jews towards them, but Antony's daughter (sister-in-law of Tiberius) at a later date sympathized obviously with monotheism even if she were not a professed monotheist, and it is possible that Antony himself may have had more than a merely political appreciation of the Jews.

The patrician party equally needed Jewish support, but the proceedings of Cassius in the East aimed at extorting rather than conciliating it.[39] The suggestion, also by Cicero, published in this, or early in the following, year, that Sibylla's teachings should be subordinated to senatorial control,[40] was not calculated to win Jewish good-will.

§ VI. *B. C.* 43–31. *Virgil and Horace. The Oracle at Delphi.*

In B. C. 43, the year after Cæsar's death, a triumvirate was formed, professedly in the interests of the popular party, by Antony, Lepidus, and Augustus Cæsar. It favored the Jews, as we learn from Antony's action in their behalf, subsequently to the defeat of Brutus and Cassius.[41]

---

[38] **Josephus** narrates in his *Antiquities* (**14**, 10, 9, 10) the joint action of Antony and Dolabella, who introduced to the Senate, or to such part of it as remained at Rome, the ambassadors of Hyrcanus, the Jewish high-priest, with whom an agreement was made, professedly in confirmation of something which Cæsar had intended. We have from the same author, in §§ 11, 12, Dolabella's action in Asia, exempting the Jews from military service. The joint action of the Senate and of Antony and Dolabella, AS CONSULS, is quoted by Josephus in detail, as if he were transcribing a public document. The date of this action is, according to his citation, February 9. The name of the month, however, must be a mistake, since Dolabella did not become consul until after the death of Cæsar in March, nor did Antony in the outset acknowledge him as consul.

[39] **Josephus** enumerates, in his *Antiquities* (**14**, 11, 2), the exaction of seven hundred talents, or about seven million dollars, from Judæa, as also the enslavement of four towns or cities. Even if the extortion be exaggerated, this was not a method of conciliation.

[40] See Appendix, Note A, foot-note 99.

[41] The action and decrees of Antony are recorded by **Josephus** in his

Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue* belongs in the earlier portion of this period, and is, of itself, evidence that Jewish writings, current under the name of Sibylla, had much hold on the public mind.[42] Some other marked allusions by him and Horace to Sibylline teachings may fall within or near the same epoch.[43] Cæsar's death gave occasion to such effusions[44] of a more temporary character. Some of these may have occasioned transient excitement, but they can have exercised no such permanent influence as the Erythræan verses, or as those moral and religious teachings, whether in the Old Testament or outside of it, which stimulated personal rectitude and appealed to the moral sense[45] and higher wants of man.

There is a feature of the times which calls here for attention. **Cicero** in his work *on Divination*, published perhaps in B. C. 44, but not later certainly than B. C. 43, puts into the mouth of his brother Quintus an explanation of why the Pythian oracle was unable, or less able than formerly, to tell the truth.[46] We shall in the course of

---

Antiquities (**14**, 12, 2–5). He reversed what Cassius had done, and set free those whom he had enslaved. The Triumvirs "managed matters according to their own will and desire, so that [to patricians?] the sole rule of Cæsar appeared [in comparison] a golden one." — **Dio Cassius, 47,** 15.

[42] See Appendix, Note A, foot-notes 51, 74.

[43] See Appendix, Note A, foot-notes 32, 58, 60, 65, 71, 80, 83, 84.

[44] See Sibyl. Orac. **11**, 261–291.

[45] The reader may wish in this connection to examine the Appendix, Note A, § VIII.

[46] Quintus Cicero attributed foreknowledge to natural endowment (see Appendix, Note A, foot-note 96), and also, as apparent in the present extract, to some force of nature, but not to the inspiration of a superhuman being. "Could that Oracle at Delphi have been so celebrated and renowned, so loaded with gifts of all peoples and kings, unless every age had experienced the truth of its oracles? Since a long time IT HAS CEASED TO DO SO. As now it has less renown because the truth of its oracles is less prominent, so formerly it had not been so honored save for its eminent truthfulness. Perhaps that power from the earth, which used to excite the mind of Pythia by a divine influence, may have vanished by age as we see some rivers to have dried up, or else to be twisted, or deflected, into a different channel. But be that as you will, for the question

this work find a discussion as to why it had died out.[47] The decadence of the Oracle kept such approximate pace with the spread of Judaism as to justify a belief that Jewish teachings, aided eventually by those of Christians, had no slight share in driving it out of repute.

A fair question may be whether Cicero exaggerated his brother's belief, or any then existing Stoic belief, in omens. He himself, in his *De Legibus*, written during patrician rule, had strongly advocated that religious matters should be exclusively controlled by the Senate.[48] His work, *De Divinatione*, though finished, or retouched, after Cæsar's death, must have been mostly written during that individual's supremacy. In this he endeavors to show that he had less sympathy with, and belief in, the state religion than even the (half-Judaized) Stoics.

The first book of Satires by **Horace** was, according to all critics of his writings, published during the period covered by the present section. It contains two passages, one of which strongly illustrates the deep hold taken by Judaism on the Romans, and the other implies proselyting activity on the part of Jews. Horace represents himself in one of these as trying to shake off a bore, who had fastened on him in the street. In his predicament he stops a friend whom he meets, and — after a hint that he wished relief from his prior companion — remarks, "You had private business with me." The friend responds, Yes, "but this is the THIRTIETH sabbath," or, in other words, the last day of the passover, the great day of the feast; and excuses himself on the ground that he in common with THE MANY, could not use such a day for business.[49]

---

is a large one, yet let this be considered as established, — which is undeniable, unless we would upset all history, — that that oracle was during many ages veracious." — **Cicero**, *De Divinat.* **1**, (19), 37, 38.

[47] See a quotation from Lamprias in Ch. X. § IV. 3.

[48] See Ch. I. note 6.

[49] "Fuscus Aristius meets me, a special friend, who well knew the fellow. We stop. 'Where do YOU come from' and 'Where are YOU going.' He asks and gives answer. I began to take hold of and pull his unaccommodating arms, intimating by a side-look that he should extricate me. He, smiling with ill-timed jocosity, dissembled [his com-

In the other passage Horace writes: "If you do not give in, a numerous band of poets shall come to my aid, — for there are many more of us, — and, like the Jews, we will COMPEL you to give in to our crowd." [50] The passage is in striking contrast to the statement of Gibbon, who, even yet, is regarded as the standard modern historian of Rome.[51]

§ VII. *B. C.* 30 – 18. *Patrician Reaction. Virgil burlesques Part of the Erythræan Verses.*

During this period there is no direct evidence of special consequence in determining the relations of Judaism, or monotheism, towards heathenism, though one, at least, of the predictions concerning Rome's destruction belongs, IN ITS PRESENT SHAPE, to the year B. C. 30.[52] There is, however, indirect evidence that Augustus, influenced by

---

prehension of me]. I began to lose patience. 'Certainly you said you wished to speak privately with me on I do not know exactly what.' 'I remember well,' [he says,] 'but I will speak with you at a more suitable time. To-day is the thirtieth sabbath. Would you diametrically oppose the circumcised Jews?' 'I have no religious scruples,' was my answer. 'But for me, I am somewhat weaker; one of the many. You will pardon me. I will speak with you some other time.'" — **Horace**, *Satires*, Book **1**, 9, 61 – 72.

[50] **Horace**, *Satires*, Book **1**, 4, 140 – 143.

[51] "The Jewish religion was admirably fitted for defence, but it was never designed for conquest; and it seems probable that the number of proselytes was never much superior to that of apostates. . . . . The obligation of preaching to the Gentiles the faith of Moses had never been inculcated as a precept of the law, nor were the Jews inclined to impose it on themselves as a voluntary duty; . . . and whenever the God of Israel acquired any new votaries, he was much more indebted to the inconstant humor of polytheism than to the active zeal of his own missionaries." — **Gibbon**, c. 15, Vol. **2**, pp. 61, 62, Philada. edit. 1816. One better acquainted than Gibbon with Jewish habits of that date told the Scribes and Pharisees (**Matt. 23**, 15), "You traverse sea and land to make a proselyte." Of course the most zealous proselyters were usually not the moral exemplars of Judaism.

[52] See Ch. VI. § II. No. 1.

the patrician element then in power, was preparing to throw off friendship, not only towards the popular party, but towards monotheism, its ally. Virgil, who was now elaborating his Æneid under the patronage of Augustus, would hardly have converted "the chaste Æneas" of Jewish song [53] into a libertine, the shameless imitator of Ulysses, had he not deemed that such an antithesis to Jewish views of morality would be acceptable to his patron. The suppression of the Egyptian religion in B. C. 21 (see Appendix, Note H, foot-note 1) was a first step by the patricians towards reasserting their control of religious matters.

§ VIII. *B. C.* 18 – *A. D.* 2. *Attack on Monotheism and Popular Rights.*

In this period Augustus became a tool of reactionaries,[54] who made him their mouth-piece in driving from the Senate and (*Indirect Testimony*, p. 82) condemning to death their opponents. An effort was made to undo what had been accomplished for equal rights in the time of Julius Cæsar, and therewith to check the progress of monotheism. The adherents of monotheism and popular rights were, in B. C. 18 or 17, eliminated by fraud and violence from the Senate. The wealthier aristocracy took sole possession, admitting a few only of their partisans, and, as soon as Augustus became high-priest, required every one to burn frankincense before proceeding to business, — a rule which excluded monotheists and such of their allies

[53] See in Appendix, Note A, § VI. the quotation from line 42 of Horace's Secular Poem or Age Song, and compare with it the remarks on Æneas in the same Note, § II. Part D.

[54] The extent to which Livia, wife of Augustus, made herself, during her son's reign, the active instrument of the aristocracy, renders probable that they knew how, in the present instance, to avail themselves of her influence. The retirement of Tiberius, in B. C. 6, to Rhodes, was unquestionably caused by reactionaries at Rome. When Augustus attained a better comprehension of these latter, Tiberius, in A. D. 2, returned, and became (see Appendix, Note G, foot-note 8) a trusted adviser of his step-father, who, much to the disgust of patrician reactionaries, left him as his successor.

in the popular party as had too much self-respect to give themselves the appearance of believing what they did not. The Senate was turned into a secret conclave,[55] so as to render its members irresponsible to the community.

This expurgation, so called, of the Senate, was prearranged in one of those complicated ways[56] which persons are apt to adopt when wishing to conceal their real purpose. Finesse, however, failed, and force had to be employed.[57] That there was no intention of leaving liberty of action to those nominally intrusted with it, is obvious from the reproaches of Augustus to Labeo.[58] The professed fear lest the former should be assassinated was probably a political ruse to impose upon him, or create sympathy in his favor.[59] The restriction of the sena-

---

[55] See Ch. V. note 59.

[56] Augustus, according to Dio Cassius, **54**, 13, selected thirty men, after having taken an oath to choose the best, or the most prominent, for the Greek word may mean either. These thirty were each to write down the names of five others, and, from each five, one was selected by lot as a senator. These thirty senators were, each of them, again to select five. The selections, however, did not suit Augustus, and, after some progress had been made, he chose the remainder himself.

[57] The expurgation "was conducted by himself and Agrippa. On this occasion he is believed to have taken his seat as he presided, with a coat of mail under his tunic, and a sword by his side, and with ten of the stoutest men of senatorial rank, who were his friends, standing round his chair. Cordus Cremutius relates that no senator was suffered to approach him, except singly, and after having his bosom searched." —**Sueton.** *August.* 35, Bohn's trans.

[58] "When Antistius Labeo inscribed him (Lepidus) among the senators . . . (Augustus) at first charged him with perjury and threatened him with punishment. But on his saying, 'What dreadful thing have I done by retaining in the Senate one whose continuance in the high-priesthood you overlook?' (Augustus) gave no further vent to his anger." — **Dio Cass. 54**, 15.

[59] "When conversation took place in the Senate to the effect that there was need of their acting in rotation as guards for Augustus, (Antistius Labeo) not venturing to contradict, nor enduring to yield assent, [remarked] that, 'I snore, and cannot [therefore] sleep in front of him.'" — **Dio Cass. 54**, 15.

"After these things [incident to the reconstruction of the Senate] had

torial dignity to the most wealthy[60] was unlikely to secure either honesty, impartiality, or civil capacity in its members. The reactionary patricians gained their point, but at the cost of public indignation, which for a time counteracted some of its advantages. Men, of whom a need was felt, refused seats in the reconstituted Senate,[61] and Labeo, the ablest jurist of his day, refused to

---

taken place, many immediately and many subsequently were, truly or falsely, charged with plotting against him (Augustus) and Agrippa. . . . In the present instance Augustus punished some." — **Dio Cass. 54,** 15.

[60] "Augustus first fixed it" (the property requisite for a senator) "at 400,000 sesterces, afterwards increased it to double this sum, and at last even to 1,200,000 sesterces." — **Smith,** *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 1018, col. 2. Under this arrangement those who were the most unscrupulous in plundering the provinces would be best provided with the requirements for a senator. **Dio Cassius** tells us (**54,** 17) that to some persons of "worthy life," who had not acquired the property requisite for a senator, Augustus made up the deficiency. It would, however, be indubitably a mistake to suppose that he included among these people of "worthy life" any of his political opponents. It was more probably a pretext for strengthening himself in the Senate. Compare on p. 116 (in note 131) the action of Claudius about sixty years later.

[61] Augustus again undertook in B. C. 13 to reconstitute the Senate. According to Dio Cassius, "there was no longer any one found who would willingly be a senator, but there were even sons and grandsons of senators, who, some from real poverty [?], and others because humbled by the misfortunes of their ancestors [?], made little account of the senatorial dignity, and, even if enrolled, swore themselves out." — **Dio Cass. 54,** 26. This last statement means that they testified under oath to their not having the requisite pecuniary or other qualifications.

Dio is certainly mistaken when he assigns ancestral misfortune, and consequent humility, as the motive of these men. Only five years previously, in the reorganization of the Senate, multitudes were unwilling to be left out, and great dissatisfaction was occasioned by their omission. Misfortunes "to their ANCESTORS" cannot have been numerous during these five years. It would seem as if the measures of Augustus had eliminated the more conscientious, or popular senators, so that he either became ashamed of the residuum, or found it politically too weak for his purposes, and that new members, when chosen, had either too much conscience, or too much respect for popular feeling, to take a seat. Compulsion became requisite (Dio Cass. **54,** 26) as a means of filling the Senate.

be a consul.[62] He probably saw, that to accept it would render him the executive of decrees which his moral sense repudiated.

That, throughout the preceding struggle, monotheism and popular rights must, as usual, have been allies, and joint objects of patrician animosity, is plain from a number of circumstances.

In the first place it is noteworthy that, promptly after the senatorial expurgation, Agrippa, the leader and impersonation of patricianism, went for four years to Asia and Judæa, the stronghold of Judaism. This is precisely where we should expect him to go, if a blow were aimed at monotheism or at such Greek views as originated in it, so that its chief supporters needed to be soothed[63] or watched. If, on the other hand, Augustus were engaged

---

[62] "Labeo, when the consulship was offered him by Augustus, refused the honor." — *Digesta*, Book **1**, tit. 2, [§] 2, ¶ 47, in the CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS, Vol. **1**, col. (of the *Digest.*) 8; quoted also in **Smith**, *Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **1**, p. 599, col. 2, where the *et* should have been in brackets.

[63] Agrippa is said by Josephus (*Antiq.* **16**, 2, 1) to have feasted the Jews and to have offered a hecatomb of sacrifices. He also, if we may trust Philo (*Embassy to Caius*, c. 37, Paris edit. p. 726), must have been profuse in his laudation of the temple, of the high-priest's adornments, and of whatever could flatter Jewish vanity. The gifts to the temple, made professedly by his wife Julia, the daughter of Augustus, may have been his own at this date, or she may have belonged to "the many" who were imbued with reverence for Judaism, and her gifts may have been at some other time. Philo, who mentions them (*Embassy to Caius*, c. 40, Paris edit. p. 729), gives us no clue to the date at which they were made.

Agrippa, in the second of his four years' stay in Asia, made a brief expedition to Pontus, the narrative of which in Josephus (*Antiq.* **16**, 2, 2) makes no mention of fighting. Herod seems to have come to him promptly, and to have acted repeatedly in Asia Minor as mediator between Agrippa and the provincials (Josephus, *Antiq.* **16**, 2, 2, 3), paying, in some cases, the taxes of the latter to Cæsar out of his own pocket. All this is very natural if the difficulties were with Jews. It is anything but natural if they were between the Roman government and heathens. Herod consulted unscrupulously his own interests, not those of Judaism. He and Agrippa constituted themselves, in public, a mutual-laudation society, to the disgust, doubtless, of not a few among their auditors.

in a purely political contest of a local character, Agrippa was the very man whom he needed at Rome, and with whose services there he could not at this juncture have dispensed.

Secondly: the heathens, even in Asia, must have understood a blow to be aimed at the Jews, for they immediately commenced annoying them in various ways, equally as after the direct action against them in the years A. D. 19 and 41. This we can learn from the edicts which at once became necessary for repression of such annoyance,[64] —

[64] Josephus, who consciously or ignorantly misuses these documents as evidence that the Jews had been honored in times past, arranges them in his *Antiquities* (**16**, 6, 2–7) according to the dignity of the writer, beginning with Augustus. For the reader's convenience I will endeavor to number them chronologically as nearly as I can. 1. Agrippa to the Magistrates, Senate, and People of the Ephesians. 2. Agrippa to the Senate, Magistrates, and People of Cyrene. This letter alludes to a statement of the Jews that Augustus had already written to Flavius, the pretor of Libya, for the same purpose, which letter seems not to have produced its full effect. 3. Cæsar to Norbanus Flaccus. 4. Caius Norbanus Flaccus, proconsul, to the Magistrates of the Sardians, stating the purport of the foregoing letter of Cæsar. 5. Julius Antonius, proconsul, to the Magistrates, Senate, and People of the Ephesians. This Antony was doubtless that son of Mark Antony who was consul in the year B. C. 10. The honors obtained for him would naturally follow some gradation, the lesser ones earlier, and the more important ones afterward. It is probable, therefore, that he was proconsul earlier than B. C. 10. But he alludes in his missive to the acts of Agrippa, who left Asia B. C. 13, so that if we place his proconsulship in B. C. 12 or 11, we shall at least have better reasons for the date than for any other which can be selected. 6. A decree of Augustus which seems to be a general one, not addressed to any particular community, though a copy of it was to be put up in the temple of Augustus at Ancyra. In this missive Augustus calls himself high-priest, which he first became in the year B. C. 13 or 12. If we may judge from the fact that Josephus gives these letters and decrees in one connection, the probability is that the decree of Augustus was issued within a year or two after he became high-priest, or possibly in the same year.

None of these decrees grant the Jews any new privileges. They protect them against theft of their sacred books and temple-offerings; against prohibition of their assemblies and interference with their observance of the Sabbath. In an earlier passage (*Antiq.* **16**, 2, 3–5) Josephus narrates

edicts similar to those called forth by the years above mentioned.

If we now seek more direct manifestations of anti-Jewish action by the ruling powers, we find that immediately after expurgation of the Senate, access of any one was prohibited to the monotheistic or Sibylline writings in its archives.[65] Nothing could be accomplished, it seems, against the same class of writings, outside, without co-operation of the Pontifex Maximus. But this officer was Lepidus, who, to the chagrin of reactionaries, retained his position determinedly, in spite of every annoyance from the opposite faction.[66] Friends of monotheism and popular rights doubtless counselled him to persevere. When he died, in B. C. 13 or 12, Augustus became high-priest, and at once seized and burned two thousand copies of various Sibylline works. No one was allowed for the future to own any such document.[67] Whether

---

a plea made before Agrippa, in behalf of the Jews, by an orator named Nicolaus, whom Herod had selected for that purpose. The grievances specified are essentially the same, and, if we may trust Josephus, were not denied by the heathens. To a reader experienced in popular disputes and collisions there will be ground for reflection in the fact that Herod, an ally of patricianism, selected this orator. Had the Jews selected their own advocate, he might have made demands which Agrippa would have had no wish to grant, and complaints which he would have been disinclined to rectify.

[65] "He (Augustus) commanded that the Sibylline utterances ἔπη which had become illegible by age should be copied by the priests with their own hands, SO THAT NO OTHER PERSON MIGHT READ THEM." — **Dio Cass. 54,** 17. This order of course must be understood of those in public custody. It was given in B. C. 18.

[66] Augustus not only himself treated Lepidus with contumely, but subjected him to the same at the hands of his satellites (Dio Cass. **54,** 15). He also tried by legerdemain to have him omitted from the reconstituted Senate, probably as a step towards declaring him disqualified for longer continuance in the high-priesthood. Dio Cass. **54,** 15.

[67] Augustus "after having assumed, on the death of Lepidus, the office of chief priest, which he had never ventured to take away from him while living, collected from all sides and burned to the number of more than two thousand, whatever prophetic books of Greek and Latin origin were

the penalty of death for disobedience were affixed at this or at a later date cannot certainly be determined.[68] The reason assigned for this action — namely, that many follies gained currency through the established reputation of these books — would have had more appearance of being the true one if access to the senatorial collection, instead of being denied, had been previously rendered easy, so that outside documents might be corrected by those in the authorized collection.

The initiatory step against this literature in B. C. 18 or

---

in common circulation without professed, or of unreliable, authorship, *nullis vel parum idoneis auctoribus*, retaining the Sibylline books alone, and of these ONLY A SELECTION, which he deposited in two gilded chests (or perhaps bookcases) in the basement of the Palatine Apollo." — **Suetonius**, *August.* c. 31. Tacitus quotes a statement made, as he alleges, by Tiberius in writing to the Roman Senate, "that BECAUSE MANY FOLLIES WERE CIRCULATED under the established reputation, *sub nomine celebri* (of the Sibylline books), Augustus had decreed a day within which they must be brought to the city pretor, and that it should be unlawful for any private individual to have them." — **Tacitus**, *Annals*, **6**, 12. That follies were thus circulated is plain. That these were made a *pretext* for suppressing the books is natural. That Tiberius cited such action approvingly is improbable, for he was a stout friend of free discussion. Tacitus (see Note G, § v.) does not hesitate at falsely attributing to him an indorsement of aristocratic hobbies which disgusted him.

[68] "Through the inspiration of wicked demons [that is, of heathen deities who feared the overthrow of their power from the teachings contained in these books] death was decreed against those who read the books of Hystaspes or Sibylla, or the Prophets, that by fear they may turn away men who are about to attain to a knowledge of good things and keep them in servitude to themselves. But this they are not able to carry out, for we not only fearlessly read them, but offer them, as you see, to your examination, knowing that they will prove acceptable to all." — **Justin Martyr**, *Apolog.* **1**, 44. If the decree of Augustus was levelled against prophetical books in general, it might afterwards be construed to include the Old Testament prophets, whose writings Justin mentions as forbidden. In the year A. D. 19, however, it is probable enough that a perusal of the Old Testament may have been forbidden to Gentiles under penalty of death. A Roman certainly, if caught reading it, would from that year forward, whenever the aristocracy were in power, have fared hardly.

17 was accompanied by a patrician fraud in the name of Sibylla. This Greek document, elsewhere described,[69] bears evidence, not merely of non-Jewish, but of anti-Jewish, authorship, and corroborates other evidence of an anti-Jewish movement by the aristocracy. Neither they nor Augustus, whom they controlled, showed any desire to have THESE lines secreted. On the contrary, Horace was requested to translate them in an ode to be publicly sung. Sibylla, when favoring reaction, was to be heard; when teaching monotheism she was to be suppressed. A comment is elsewhere offered [70] on the omission from these lines of any attention to Saturn. Considered in connection with part of the Erythræan verses and with popular misinterpretation thereof, this omission seems reactionary. Some modifications by Horace of the translated lines show that he was not wholly subservient to the ruling class, and perhaps that public opinion would not permit him to be so.[71] One feature of his Ode throws remarkable light on the powerful impression which Jewish anticipations of Rome's impending downfall had made on the Roman mind. Horace, a court poet, in the flush of a patrician victory, when the object was to replace the NATIONAL or PATRICIAN gods in public estimation, does not venture to claim that they, if properly propitiated, will preserve to Rome her present power, but merely that Italy shall remain under her control.

Another blow at monotheism, dealt, as already mentioned, so soon as Augustus acquired the chief-priesthood, was an order that every senator, before proceeding to senatorial business, should offer frankincense.[72] Conscientious monotheists would, under such a rule, be debarred from attending the sittings of the Senate. This was doubtless one, if not the main object of the rule.

---

[69] See Appendix, Note A, § VI.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Dio Cassius (**54**, 30) places this decree in the year B. C. 12. Suetonius mentions (*Augustus*, c. 35) that the offering was to be made to that god in whose temple they were, for the time being, assembled.

Its only other supposable purpose would have been a show of respect, which no one really felt, for the old religion; and this show was unlikely to be instituted unless an opposing — which could scarce have been aught save a monotheistic — party existed in the Senate.

During, or not long after, these six years (B. C. 18 – 12) of embittered contest is the most probable epoch in which to locate an incident in the life of Augustus, preserved to us by the Lexicon of **Suidas**, without any date. "Augustus, having sacrificed, asked Pythia [the oracle of Apollo] who should reign after him; and [the oracle] answered: —

"A Hebrew SLAVE, holding control over the blessed gods, orders me
To leave this house and return to the Underworld.
Depart in silence, therefore, from our altars." [73]

The custom of consulting an oracle, if we may rely on Strabo's remark in our tenth section, must by this time have so far died out, that the action of Augustus can only be regarded as an effort to galvanize the appearance of life into what was practically dead. The answer to him may have been contrived by a zealous religionist, or by some stout-hearted champion of popular rights, who cared nothing for religion. In either case, the response must have been suggested by the anti-monotheistic procedures of Augustus, and the individual who ventured to give it must have anticipated active support from public opinion. Compare Note A, foot-note 124.

A monotheistic response which the **Cohortatio ad Græcos** mentions as given by a heathen oracle bears no evidence, as in the foregoing case, of VIRULENT antagonism. It may belong to the present or to a different period; but hardly to any date after the introduction of

[73] The reader should emphasize the word SLAVE if he would realize the intended contempt for heathen deities. Some of the aristocracy, in their zeal to exclude Tiberius, the friend of popular rights, may have prompted the question of Augustus. They doubtless preconcerted an answer, for which the above was adroitly substituted. If answers were in writing, as questions seem to have been (see Ch. X. note 53), this could be effected with less risk than if they were *viva voce*.

Christianity, since, if so, a Christian would not have quoted it approvingly.[74]

The anti-monotheistic efforts of the reactionaries during this period were directed in more ways than one towards giving an appearance of life to heathenism. Augustus "RE-ESTABLISHED, also, some of the ancient ceremonials which had GRADUALLY BEEN DONE AWAY, as the augury for [public] safety; the priesthood of Jupiter; the Lupercalia; the Secular and Compitalician games."[75] How little all this availed towards making men prefer heathenism to monotheism will be seen in the next and in almost each succeeding period.

The cause of monotheism and that of popular rights appear in this, as in other periods, to have been conjoined with that of morality. It is, of course, probable that either of these two allies found advocates whose morality was below, or not above, the average. Yet among monotheists MORALITY WAS AN OBJECT OF CULTURE, and in the popular party it met with less ridicule and more active support than among partisans of aristocracy. The court circle, in which writings such as some of Horace's circulated, must have been devoid of shame. Augustus, though not a debauchee, was not a moralist, nor, at this period certainly, did his influence favor morality. In B. C. 18 he "ordained rather severe penalties for unmarried men and women; and, on the other hand, established rewards for marriage and the production of children."[76]

---

[74] "When some one, according to your own (i. e. heathen) accounts, asked from one of your own oracles, 'What men had become recognizers of God,' you yourselves say that the oracle responded: —

'Only Chaldeans and Hebrews have obtained wisdom,
Reverencing in purity God the self-born king.'"

Cohortatio ad Græcos, c. 11; compare c. 24.

Unless the word translated *and* mean *even* or *namely*, this would imply that Chaldeans had adopted monotheism.

[75] **Suetonius**, *Augustus*, c. 31. The secular games took place, as we have seen, in B. C. 17. The priesthood of Jupiter, which had died out in B. C. 87, seems, from Dio Cassius (**54**, 36) to have been re-established in B. C. 11. Among the priesthoods of INDIVIDUAL gods it was the highest.

[76] **Dio Cass. 54**, 16.

This law, however, must have impeded, rather than aided, a healthy moral sentiment.[77] Its provisions showed that its framers appreciated neither marriage nor morality, and the law itself strikingly illustrates reactionary views on these subjects. Complaint was made in the Senate over the prevailing dissoluteness among women and young men as a preventive to marriage, and Augustus was urged to rectify this also. The remarks, Dio tells us, were intended as a reflection on his conduct. He at first replied, that "what was most needful had ALREADY BEEN ENACTED, and the remainder could not be in like manner surrendered [to legal supervision ?]."[78] Human experience has evinced that legislation can at best but mitigate, not obviate, immorality. The first of the above two statements was, however, incorrect, and Augustus, when pressed, showed that he was talking at random.[79]

§ IX. *Schools of Law.*

The preceding contest gave rise, or prominence, to two schools of law which confronted each other for at least a century and a half, and more probably for three centu-

---

[77] The law affixed penalties to a divorced woman if she remained unmarried more than six months; also to a widow if she remained unmarried more than a year. A legacy to a bachelor was void unless he qualified himself for its acceptance by getting married within one hundred days. These provisions were somewhat mitigated in A. D. 9, by an extension of time. See **Smith**, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 692, col. 1, under *Lex Julia* and *Lex Papia Poppæa*. The law seems to have ignored affection, mutual respect, and moral sense as a basis for marriage, and to have considered it MERELY with reference to increase of population.

[78] **Dio Cass. 54**, 16.

[79] "Being pressed, he said, 'You ought to admonish and command your wives what you think proper, AS I DO.' Hearing this they urged him the more, wishing to learn the admonitions which he professed to have given Livia; and he, though against his will, stated something concerning dress and other ornamentation, and concerning going out and womanly modesty, regardless of the fact that his statements were not believed." — **Dio Cass. 54**, 16. Moralists who most appreciated social corruption were least likely to find relief in rendering Augustus ridiculous, however natural such action may have been in political opponents.

ries, until Christianity became dominant.[80] These claim a slight interruption in our chronological narrative. Capito, favored by Augustus, was the advocate of the privileged classes, and therefore of Ancient Usage; Labeo upheld equity and human rights. The verdict of posterity concerning them may be inferred from the following statements: "Notwithstanding the great legal reputation of Capito, not a single *pure* extract from any of his works occurs in the *Digest*, though there are a few quotations from him at second hand."[81] "The extracts from Labeo in the *Digest* occupy about twelve pages [as printed] in Hommel's *Palingenesia Pandectarum*. They are sixty in number. But the name of Labeo occurs in other passages of the *Digest* no fewer than five hundred and forty-one times."[82] **J. T. Graves,** author of articles on Capito and Labeo, says that "the conclusions of Capito's school seem, in a majority of instances, to have prevailed in practice."[83] This, in consideration of what has already been said, can hardly mean more than that, during the influence of a heathen aristocracy and under their pet emperors, the school of ancient usage bore sway. When

---

[80] "After him (Tubero) Anteius Capito . . . and Antistius Labeo were regarded as the highest authorities. . . . These two first established what might be called different schools; for Anteius Capito adhered persistently to tradition; Labeo, by mental constitution, *ingenii qualitate*, and by the confidence which his learning inspired, — for he had studied largely outside of his profession, — commenced many innovations." — **Pomponius,** quoted in *Digest* **1**, 2, 2, 47. "There is no proof that there was ever a distinct middle school." — **Smith,** *Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **1**, p. 601, col. 2. To the school of Capito belonged Masurius Sabinus, Caius Cassius Longinus, Cælius Sabinus, Priscus Javolenus, Aburnus Valens, Tuscianus, and Julianus. To that of Labeo belonged Nerva (the father), Proculus, Nerva (the son), another Longinus, Pegasus, Celsus (the father), Celsus (the son), and Priscus Neratius. The friendship of the elder Nerva for Tiberius implies that he adhered to, not, as some suppose (Smith, *Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **1**, p. 601, col. 2), that he swerved from the school of Labeo. For the above list, see *Digest* **1**, 2, 2, 47.

[81] **Smith,** *Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **1**, p. 600, col. 1.

[82] Same work, Vol. **2**, p. 693, col. 1.

[83] **Smith,** *Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **1**, pp. 601, 602.

heathenism was overthrown, Capito was soon neglected. He seems — judging from the incidents recorded in Tacitus — to have been mentally and morally a man of small calibre,[84] though party spirit, correctly or incorrectly, gave him the credit of great learning.

Labeo's methodical industry, added to his other qualifications, must have rendered him invaluable to the advocates of legal reform.[85] The remark of Horace, "*more crazy than Labeo*," [86] shows how he was viewed by patrician conservatives.

Neither Hadrian nor his successor, Antoninus Pius, were devotees of the privileged classes.[87] Possibly the distinc-

---

[84] Ennius, a Roman knight, was charged in A. D. 22 with treason, because he had melted a silver statue of Tiberius. The justice and good sense of the latter forbade his prosecution. Capito treated the emperor's refusal as an interference with senatorial rights and a permission for crime against the republic. **Tacitus**, after narrating these circumstances, adds that: "Capito's infamy [in this] attracted more attention, because, versed as he was in law human and divine, he *dehonestavisset* had brought reproach upon an eminent public [that is, upon the aristocracy] and on the *bonas artes* professional skill of his house [or in other words, of himself]." — *Annals*, **3**, 70. This means that the reactionaries treated Capito's overzeal as a political blunder which had cost standing to them and prestige to him.

[85] "Labeo . . . divided the year so that he should be six months with his students at Rome and for six months be absent [in the country] devoting himself to writing books." — *Digest.* **1**, 2, 47.

[86] If **Horace**, as some think, wrote his *Satire* before Labeo was of an age to attract attention, he may have subsequently retouched it. He alludes evidently to the great reformer. "If any one should crucify his slave because, when ordered to take his plate away, he had tasted the half-eaten fishes and half-cold sauce, [such a one], though more insane than Labeo, would be reckoned among sane men." — *Sat.* **1**, 3, 80–83. Atrocities under Trajan caused under Hadrian a much needed transfer of death-power from masters (see Ch. X. note 131) to the courts.

[87] Hadrian (cp. p. 325) decided that decisions of jurists "should have the force of law, provided the respondents all agreed in their answers; but if they differed the judge was at liberty to adhere to whichever opinion he preferred." — **Sandars**, *Introduct. to Institutes of Justinian*, p. 18. Cp. Gaius, **1**, 7, Boecking's edit. p. 3.

tion of schools became less prominent under the latter. If so, the aristocracy must have found it more difficult to regain control of legal decisions than of political power. Pomponius, however, lived near the middle of the second century, and his list, already given, would naturally terminate with jurists of the preceding generation. Legal decisions were certainly in a state of change until after Christianity had gained the ascendency,[88] and it is likely that heathen views found legal defenders so long as heathenism had power.

In effecting legal reform the chief aid afforded by monotheism must have been through the strength which it imparted to the individual and public conscience, and through the feeling of human brotherhood which it inspired. Yet aside from this, the influence of Judaism upon the Greek Stoics seems to have reacted upon Roman law.[89] There were perhaps two reasons for this. Firstly:

---

[88] "If we compare the Institutes of Justinian with those of Gaius, we find changes in the law of marriage, in that of succession, and in many other branches of law, in which it is not difficult to recognize the spirit of humanity and reverence for natural ties which Christianity had inspired." — **Sandars**, *Introduct. to Institutes of Justinian*, p. 21.

[89] "By far the most important addition to the system of Roman law which the jurists introduced from [*Judaism mingled with ?*] Greek philosophy was the conception of the *lex naturæ*. We learn from the writings of Cicero whence this conception came, and what was understood by it. It came from the Stoics, and especially from Chrysippus. By *natura*, for which Cicero sometimes substitutes *mundus*, was meant the universe of things, and this universe the Stoics declared to be guided by reason. . . . By *lex naturæ*, therefore, was meant primarily the determining force of the universe, a force inherent in the universe by its constitution (*lex est naturæ vis*). But man has reason, and as reason cannot be twofold, the *ratio* of the universe must be the same as the *ratio* of man, and the *lex naturæ* will be the law by which the actions of man are to be guided, as well as the law directing the universe. Virtue, or moral excellence, may be described as living either in accordance with reason, or with the law of the universe. These notions worked themselves into Roman law, and the practical shape they took was that morality, so far as it could come within the scope of judges, was regarded as enjoined by law. . . . When a rigid adherence to the doctrines of the *jus civile* threat-

among opponents of long-established error there are always some who lay more stress on opinions of a reputedly learned foreigner than on the carefully exercised judgments of themselves and neighbors. Again: there is a disposition in some minds to support new views by clothing them in established phraseology. This class must have been thankful for the Stoic phrase "Law of [universal] Nature." It enabled them when opposing legal abominations to regard themselves as upholding, not as overturning, ESTABLISHED law.[90] They did not perceive that in their mouths the phrase lacked meaning.[91]

---

ened to do a moral wrong, and produce a result that was not equitable, then the *lex naturæ* was supposed to operate, and the pretor, in accordance with its dictates, provided a remedy by means of the pliant forms of the pretorian actions. Gradually the cases, as well as the modes in which he would thus interfere, grew more and more certain and recognized, and thus a body of equitable principles was introduced into the Roman law. The two great agents in modifying and extending the old, rigid, narrow system of the *jus civile* were thus the *jus gentium* and the *lex naturæ;* that is, generalizations from the legal system of other nations, and morality looked on according to the philosophy of the Stoics as sanctioned by a law. . . . The *jus gentium* and *lex naturæ* were each the complement of the other, and were often looked on by the jurists as making one whole, to which the term *jus gentium* was generally applied." — **Sandars** (except the insertion in brackets), *Introduct. to Institutes of Justinian*, pp. 13, 14. Sandars refers to Cicero, *De Leg.* **1**, 6–12; *De Nat. Deor.* **1**, 14; **2**, 14, 31; *De Fin.* **4**, 7.

[90] "Law is the SUPREME REASON dwelling in nature which orders what is proper to be done and prohibits the contrary." — **Cicero**, *De Legibus*, **1**, 6.

[91] A Stoic, while believing in a moral intelligence which animated and ruled the universe, could by the *Lex Naturæ*, LAW OF [UNIVERSAL] NATURE, or, as Cicero sometimes words it, *Lex Mundi*, LAW OF THE UNIVERSE, mean approximately what a Jew would have understood by the Will of God. To other heathens, who deemed nature or the universe inanimate, ITS decisions on legal or moral questions must have been imaginary. Much of what was good in civil law, though expressed in Latin, originated and was first promulgated in monotheistic Greek-speaking lands.

§ x. *A. D.* 2–14. *Augustus recedes from ultra-Patricianism.*

The year in which our last chronological section ended and the present one begins witnessed the first step of Augustus towards retreating out of reactionary influence. His emancipation, for a time at least, was but partial. Eight years before this date Tiberius had been — informally, perhaps — banished, and had gone to Rhodes. There he seems to have lived a quiet life of self-improvement, attending lectures, visiting the sick, and sometimes reconciling those who had quarrelled. Augustus, who had felt the need of a thoughtful, unselfish adviser, recalled him in A. D. 2, and though this could not reverse what patricianism had accomplished, yet it mitigated the consequent evils.

In scrutinizing the effect thus far produced upon the community by efforts at reaction, we shall find that monotheism, if excluded from the Senate, must, outside of that body, have had strong hold on the upper as well as the common classes. It would be unsafe to infer that every one who — even without political motive — paid his devotions at Jerusalem was a monotheist. Yet, if Augustus thanked his grandson for not doing so,[92] we can feel assured that monotheism commanded the belief of many, and the respect of still more, among the higher classes. Augustus would hardly have commended in his grandson a course which was but the common, or universal, one in the class to which he belonged.

A passage of **Strabo**, published in this epoch, tells us: "Soothsaying of all kinds, and oracles, were especially honored by the ancients, but are now oppressed by much contempt, the Romans being satisfied with the oracles of Sibylla and Etruscan divinations. . . . Wherefore the Oracle of Ammon has nearly died out."[93] In

---

[92] **Suetonius**, *Augustus*, c. 93, quoted in Ch. V. note 130. This journey must have taken place from somewhere in B. C. 1 to A. D. 4. In the former year Caius went to Asia. In February of the latter year he died.

[93] **Strabo**, *Geographica*, **17**, 1, 43; pp. 1134, 1135, edit. Meineke.

determining whether this tendency were chiefly owing to general enlightenment, or to the progress of monotheism, we can derive some light from the leaders of the conservative, or aristocratic party, who, as will be found under A. D. 41, attribute it to the progress of "Foreign Rites," that is, of Judaism. The probability is, that, even when Strabo wrote, the manifestations of reverence for Etruscan divination were confined to the conservative, and those of reverence for Sibylline teaching to the progressive, party.

Still another incident helps to indicate the point at which the contest between monotheism and heathenism had arrived. In A. D. 5 a Vestal Virgin was to be selected. High honors belonged to the office, and yet parents opposed the placing of their daughters on the list of candidates.[94] Augustus was vehement to no purpose in trying to change their resolution, and the office had to be opened to women whose parents had once been slaves.[95] At a later date ultra conservatives among the aristocracy became more desperate in their support of heathen RECOLLECTIONS, and of departing institutions; for their action can hardly be termed either a result or a support of heathen BELIEF.

If we now turn to Livy, whose history belongs approximately to this date,[96] we shall find ground to query whether some phraseology which he uses, or quotes, did not result from Jewish influences. Before citing it, an

---

[94] Augustus "increased not only the number and dignity of the priests, but also their emoluments, especially of the Vestal Virgins. And when in the place of one who had died another was to be taken, and many made interest that their daughters' names should NOT be subjected to the [chance of] drawing, he swore that if the age of any one among his granddaughters were sufficient, he would offer her." — **Suetonius**, *Augustus*, c. 31.

[95] "And since the really well-born were unwilling to give their daughters for the priesthood of Vesta, a law was enacted that the daughters of freed persons might hold that office." — **Dio Cass. 55**, 22.

[96] Livy was born in B. C. 59, and died in A. D. 17. His history must have been finished after 9 B. C., as it came down to the death of Drusus.

explanation is requisite. Ancient writers often put into the mouth of real or supposed speakers arguments apposite to, or used by, that side which they are regarded as representing, — a custom which has not totally died out in the present century.[97] In accordance with this custom, Livy has given us the speech of a patrician lady named Virginia. She had married a plebeian, and the patrician ladies on that account excluded her, in B. C. 296, from some sacred rites. Her dispute with them, and her subsequent address to plebeian women, can hardly have been matter of record, but **Livy** represents her, in the course of the former, as calling herself the "wife of one husband,"[98] *uni nuptum.* As the earliest Christian assemblies

---

[97] "There will be found, in the course of this history, several discourses of a certain length. Those I have put in the mouth of the different speakers have really been pronounced by them, and upon those very occasions which are treated of in the work. I should, however, mention, that I have sometimes MADE A SINGLE ORATOR SAY WHAT HAS BEEN SAID IN SUBSTANCE BY OTHERS OF THE SAME PARTY. Sometimes, also, but rarely, using the liberty granted in all times to historians, I have ventured to ADD A SMALL NUMBER OF PHRASES, which appeared to me to coincide perfectly with the sense of the orator and proper to enforce his opinion; this has appeared especially in the two discourses pronounced before Congress, for and against independence, by Richard Henry Lee and John Dickinson." — **Botta,** *War of Independence*, trans. by Otis, p. v; N. Haven edit. 1838.

Smyth, in his *Lectures on Modern History* (Vol. **1**, pp. 134–138, Am. edit.), comments on the fabrication of speeches by Hume and by Sir J. Hayward, neither of whom puts his readers on their guard, as does Botta, by stating what he had been doing. Botta's plan is a well-intentioned mistake. The action of Hume and Sir J. Hayward is more culpable, whatever be the palliation sought for it in customs of earlier historians. Yet even their conduct — fabricating speeches to convey what they DEEMED essentially true — must not be confounded with that of Tacitus, Philo, and others, whose fabricated speeches and conversations are intended to make readers believe what they themselves KNEW to be false. Compare in Appendix, Note G, foot-note 123.

[98] Virginia, according to the narrative, proceeded, after her exclusion, to set apart a portion of her own premises, on which she built an altar to "Plebeian Chastity." Then, calling together plebeian matrons, she

were apparently modelled after the Jewish synagogues, Paul's language justifies the supposition that divorced persons were not assigned to prominent positions in the religious assemblies of the Jews.[99]

If the words of Livy were copied from documents dating three centuries before the Christian era, they would represent, doubtless, ideas which originated with heathens. If, like many of his narratives, they represent traditions of his own time embellished by himself, they probably result from Jewish views, which had been adopted by the more moral among the Romans. The latter remark does not deny to the heathens moral sense, nor, to a portion of them, appreciation for conjugal fidelity. But their GODS were not supposed to take interest in moral wrongs, unless committed against themselves or their favorites.

The question deserves investigation by students either of antiquity or of man's moral history, whether the terms "husband of one wife" and "wife of one husband" can be traced in Roman literature to an earlier date than that of Jewish influence.[100]

---

addressed them as follows: "I dedicate this altar to 'Plebeian Chastity,' and exhort you, that, as the men in this state vie with each other in bravery, the matrons should, in like manner, vie in chastity; and that you should exert yourselves so that this altar may, if possible, be regarded as having a holier worship and from chaster persons than that one [of Patrician Chastity]." Livy continues: "The religious services of this altar were almost the same as those of that older one; so that no one save a matron of approved chastity, the wife of one husband, could sacrifice at it." — **Livy, 10,** 23.

[99] "For this object I left thee in Crete that . . . thou shouldst appoint elders in every city . . . if any one is blameless, the husband of one wife . . . for an overseer, being God's steward, should be blameless." — **Titus, 1,** 5–7. "An overseer should be blameless, the husband of one wife." — **1 Tim. 3,** 2. "Let a woman be deemed a widow [entitled to public support] when not less than sixty years old, the wife of one husband." — **1 Tim. 5,** 9.

[100] In the Lexicon of Facciolati and Forcellini, under the word *pronubus*, the brideswoman at a marriage is said, in one citation, to have been customarily the wife of one husband. But of the two references, one is to Tertullian, two centuries after the Christian era. Of the other,

§ XI. *A. D.* 14–18. *Tiberius Emperor. Patrician Steps towards Rebellion.*

In A. D. 14 Augustus died, after selecting Tiberius as his successor. The selection was prompted by his appreciation of the latter, and amounted to a confession of having been misled by his previous surrounders. Tiberius entered on his duties while an adverse faction controlled both the Senate and most of the public offices. In more than one instance the Senate acted in opposition to him. Its leaders deified Augustus promptly after his death in the hope, apparently, of rendering it sacrilegious for Tiberius to undo any of the reaction which they had effected through his step-father.[101] His position was additionally embarrassed by the fact that his mother sympathized with the aristocratic faction, and, through defects in her

---

"Fest. Varr. *apud* Serv. ad Æn. **4**, 166," I have not means to determine the date, but see no reason for regarding it as earlier than Livy.

The office of *Flamen Dialis*, priest of Jupiter, died out in B. C. 87, and was revived in B. C. 11, by Augustus. Its incumbent, according to **Smith**, *Dict. of Antiquities*, p. 541, col. 1, "could not marry a second time. Hence, since her [his wife's] assistance was essential to the performance of certain ordinances, a divorce was not permitted, and if she died, the Dialis was obliged to resign." If the first of these statements means that he must be living with his first wife when appointed to office, —an idea not necessarily implied in Aulus Gellius, **10**, 15, —then the date when this view originated would become a matter of interest. If first established in the time of Augustus, it would tend to show that the leader of heathenism could not, in his effort to re-establish heathen rites, ignore the Jewish idea of connection between morality and the holding of a prominent religious position.

[101] How immediately the deification of Augustus was used for the purpose of tying his successor's hands may be inferrred from the following. Already in A. D. 14 (Tac. *An.* **1**, 54) some public players caused a disturbance, which broke out more violently, and with considerable loss of life, in A. D. 15. Some wished to have the players whipped. The opposite view prevailed, "because the GOD Augustus had given his opinion that players were exempt from whipping, nor would it be RELIGIOUSLY LAWFUL for Tiberius to contravene his decisions." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **1**, 77. Compare in Ch. I. note 9, citation from Dio Cassius.

character of which they knew how to avail themselves, became their tool to counteract his best efforts.

The serious events of this period are clearly connected with those in the next chapter. That this connection may not be interrupted, a piece of party pleasantry will first be narrated.

In A. D. 15 a destructive inundation of the Tiber gave occasion to party humorousness. Asinius Gallus moved a consultation of Sibylline books. His political relations[102] imply that his meaning must have been somewhat as follows: "You reactionaries loudly advocate adherence to ancient usage. For once you shall have co-operation from me. Among old customs none was ever better established than a consultation of Sibylline books in time of physical calamity. I move, AS A MEANS OF ALLAYING THE TIBER, that we thoroughly scrutinize the monotheistic teachings, which you secrete so carefully." The motion was admirably calculated for placing reactionaries in a ludicrous light. Assent to it would render them ridiculous; opposition would prove them insincere. Those against whom it was aimed had been, and continued to be, enemies of Tiberius. Yet he did not join in the jest at their expense, and must even have discouraged any pressing of the motion made by his friend Gallus.[103] The

---

[102] Gallus at a later period needed and received from Tiberius a guard, without which his life would have been in danger from the reactionaries. His father — of the anti-senatorial faction, and founder of the first public library at Rome — was the Pollio to whom Virgil addressed his half-messianic Eclogue, and with whom, according to Josephus, *Antiq.* **15,** 10, 1, the young Jewish princes, sons of Herod, abode while in Rome.

[103] "Tiberius opposed (the motion of Gallus) as if desirous to conceal things divine and human." — **Tacitus,** *Annals,* **1,** 76. The phraseology in which this is couched might be understood as the language of superstition. It is far more probably a dexterous effort of the historian to withdraw attention from the awkward predicament of the conservative party. If they supported a motion to consult the Sibylline Books as a preventive against overflow of the Tiber they must have rendered themselves a laughing-stock for the community, and have gratified their opponents by investigation into a storehouse of anti-heathen teaching. If

Senate entrusted to a committee of two, Anteius Capito and Lucius Arruntius, the engineering question of a remedy for overflows. Both of these were conservatives, and the remedy which they advised proved unacceptable to the popular party, as we may infer from the opposition not merely of the country districts but of Piso, whose subsequent opposition to the senatorial faction cost him his life.

We will now turn to political matters, whose culmination, as will appear in the next chapter, was connected with expulsion of Judaism from Rome and the effort to crush its Gentile converts.

Germanicus[104] at the date of his uncle's accession commanded the Roman armies in Germany, and was then already concerned, as it would seem, in a conspiracy against him. He threatened, and almost undoubtedly authorized, a butchery of soldiers whose fidelity to his uncle forbade acquiescence in the plot of himself and of his co-conspirators.[105] His effort to move the soldiers by a

---

they opposed it they would show the insincerity of their professed attachment to ancient religious customs. Tacitus wishes his reader to believe, what he is careful not to affirm, that the motion was lost because of opposition from Tiberius.

[104] The brother of Tiberius, named Drusus, sympathized with the aristocratic party. He died in B. C. 9. His widow Antonia, and his daughter Livilla, married to her cousin, the younger Tiberius, sympathized with the popular party. Of his two surviving sons, Germanicus was active on the patrician side; the other, Claudius, though an imbecile, was at a later date made emperor by the patricians.

[105] Tacitus says of the legions, "Earnest were their hopes that Germanicus would never brook the rule of another."— **Tac.** *An.* **1**, 31, Bohn's trans. The remark may be true of not a few officers. "Germanicus . . . sent letters before him to Cæcina, 'that he was coming with a powerful force; and, if they prevented him not by executing the guilty, he would put them to the sword indiscriminately.' These letters Cæcina privately read to the standard-bearers, the inferior officers, and such of the private soldiers as were least disaffected. . . . The officers, having sounded those they believed fit for their purpose, and found the majority of the legions still to persevere in their duty, at the suggestion of the general, settled a time for putting to the sword all the most depraved and turbulent; then,

show of suicide was no more successful than his efforts at compulsion. One of the soldiers composedly offered him his sword, saying, "It is sharper than yours." [106] He had probably conspired with the Senate, whose deputies met him at Bonn.[107] The fidelity of the soldiery to Tiberius and to the popular party rendered necessary a prompt dismissal of these deputies under guard. Some of the higher officers were in the conspiracy, and also CHÆREA, whom the Senate afterwards employed to murder Caligula. Germanicus was offered the empire.[108] The story that the legions revolted means that they refused obedience to himself and to such officers as were in the conspiracy.[109]

Germanicus himself must for a time have been detained a prisoner by the soldiery.[110] He gave vent to his

---

on a signal given among themselves, they rushed into their tents and butchered them, while in utter ignorance of the plot; none but those who were privy to it understanding wherefore the massacre began, or where it would end." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **1,** 48, Bohn's trans. The concluding remarks imply that the men had not been in open revolt, otherwise the object of the massacre would have been obvious.

[106] **Dio Cass. 57,** 5.

[107] Tacitus, *An.* **1,** 39.

[108] Tacitus, *An.* **1,** 31 – 35.

[109] Silius, who at the accession of Tiberius commanded on the Upper Rhine a large army, boasted at a later date, "that his soldiery had retained their subordination [to their commanding officers] when others had broken out in sedition ; nor would the imperial dignity have remained with Tiberius if those [the other] legions had been desirous of a revolution." — **Tac.** *An.* **4,** 18. A somewhat similar occurrence took place when the pro-slavery rebellion in the United States broke out. Army officers, appointed during dominance of the slave-holding aristocracy, and by their influence, adhered in considerable numbers to the class from which they sprung, or to which they owed promotion. The common soldiers, almost without exception, proved true to the government and the cause of equal rights. No mutual butchery, however, was even meditated. These remarks are also true concerning navy officers and common seamen. One instance of a common seaman refusing obedience when ordered by an officer to pull down the national flag is given in Moore, *Rebellion Record, Diary,* p. 43.

[110] **Tacitus** puts into the mouth of Germanicus a speech, fabricated

disappointment, or sought to obscure his efforts for imperial dignity, by carrying on war against the natives in a vehement and brutal manner.[111] In fact, at a yet later date his inhumanity[112] must have been anything but agreeable to an uncle who was habitually just and forbearing even to an enemy, and who proved remarkably successful in maintaining peace with other nations.

In A. D. 16, after an unsuccessful campaign, Tiberius had recalled to Rome the reluctant Germanicus.[113] So soon as this was accomplished, Germany quieted down and remained peaceful towards Rome during the whole reign of the former.

---

probably by himself, from which the following is an extract: "Shall I call you soldiers who have besieged [me] the son of your emperor by a rampart and with arms? Shall I call you citizens, you by whom SENATORIAL authority is set at naught?" — Tacitus, *An.* **1**, 42.

[111] "He wasted the country by fire and sword to the extent of fifty miles; nor sex nor age found mercy; places sacred and profane, without distinction, even the temple of Tanfana, the most celebrated amongst these nations, all were levelled with the ground." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **1**, 51, Bohn's trans. "He fell upon the Cattians with such surprise, that ALL THE WEAK THROUGH SEX OR AGE WERE INSTANTLY TAKEN OR SLAUGHTERED; their youth [from the other side] swam over the Adrana and endeavored to obstruct the Romans, who commenced building a bridge; then, repulsed by engines and arrows, and having in vain tried terms of peace, after some had gone over to Germanicus, the rest abandoned their cantons and villages, and dispersed themselves into the woods." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **1**, 56, Bohn's trans.

[112] "Germanicus . . . exhorted his men 'to prosecute the slaughter; they wanted no captives,' he said; 'the extermination of the people alone would put an end to the war.'" — **Tac.** *An.* **2**, 21, Bohn's trans. **Suetonius** tells us (*Tiberius*, c. 52) that Tiberius, in speaking of his nephew's doings, "depreciated his most illustrious exploits as *supervacuis*, worse than objectless, and found fault with his most glorious victories as detrimental to the Republic."

[113] Tacitus, *An.* **2**, 26. Tiberius may, in recalling his nephew, have avoided harshness, but the letter to Germanicus which Tacitus puts into his mouth must be fabricated. He seems not to have discouraged in others a triumphal reception of his nephew, though he knew that the chief part of the reception given to him had been gotten up for political effect, by an aristocracy hostile to himself.

A year, approximately, after his recall, the aristocratic party made another move. "By a decree of the Fathers the provinces beyond the sea were granted to Germanicus with an authority wherever he went superior to such as held their positions by [senatorial] lot or by commission from the prince." [114] This was intended to give him authority certainly over all governors of Asiatic provinces, and has been understood as subjecting Egypt to him also. If these immense powers were conferred in the terms used by Tacitus, they were equivalent to revolution, for they abrogated a settled division of jurisdiction between the prince and Senate which had been in force nearly half a century,[115] and was, equally as any other existing arrangement, part of the agglomeration that served as a constitution. Perhaps the commission of Germanicus was ambiguously worded, so as to permit the construction affixed to it by Tacitus.

Tiberius, to prevent the threatening mischief, sent, as governor, to Syria, his friend Piso,[116] whose manliness in a trying position justified his selection. He reached Syria

---

[114] **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 43.

[115] The division took place under Augustus in B. C. 27, and is given in detail by Dio Cassius, **53**, 12. Syria, Phœnicia, and Cilicia were apportioned, in Asia, to the prince. Outside of Asia, Egypt was one of the provinces which fell to him. The aristocracy — though deifying Augustus, that his acts in their favor might be held inviolable — would, to gain more power, have abrogated any and every thing done by him. The army had for half a century been under control of the prince.

[116] Piso had in B. C. 7 been consul conjointly with Tiberius. The latter went into exile within a twelvemonth after expiration of his office, — an evidence that things during this consulship did not satisfy the reactionary aristocracy. It gave Tiberius opportunity to estimate his colleague, whose selection, behavior, and fate, in the present conflict, render it probable that he had been a fast friend of justice rather than of patrician claims. His friendship for Tiberius was free from obsequiousness, as appears in his pleasantry (Tacitus, *An.* **1**, 74), and in his desire (Tacitus, *An.* **2**, 35) that business should proceed as usual during an expected absence of the emperor. Gallus, who opposed this latter motion, may have estimated patrician objects and unscrupulousness more correctly than the frank-hearted Piso.

early in A. D. 18, and nearly at the same time Germanicus, who had left Rome earlier, landed in Asia Minor. Piso at once commenced drilling the legions,[117] and changed some officers, substituting, doubtless, for men in the patrician interest, others on whom he could rely.[118] Germanicus almost immediately set out for a foreign country, Armenia, and went through the farce of crowning a king there. This secured him favor and the promise, doubtless, of co-operation from the faction which the king represented. He then ordered Piso to lead part of the Syrian legions into Armenia. Piso, who knew that his duties lay in the Roman province of Syria, not in the foreign country of Armenia, forbore — as did Tiberius throughout his reign — any interference with the internal affairs of a foreign nation. Subsequently, at a banquet, Germanicus and his wife accepted golden crowns from the king of the Nabathæans, a people in Northern Arabia. Yet later, at the request of Artabanus, king of the Parthians, and with a view, no doubt, to his alliance, he, against the will of Piso, sent as a prisoner from Syria into Cilicia, Vonones, an expatriated Parthian king, a friend of Tiberius, living under Roman protection. The unfortunate man, a person apparently of culture, was promptly afterwards murdered.[119]

---

[117] Tacitus says (*An.* **2**, 55) that Piso allowed the soldiery to live IDLY IN CAMP, ill-behaved in the cities, and to roam mischievously about the country. But in the same paragraph he unwittingly betrays that this was the reverse of truth, by charging Piso's wife with lack of feminine modesty in attending the military exercises of cavalry and infantry.

[118] Silanus, the previous governor of Syria, was connected with Germanicus by the intermarriage of their children, and had possibly been arranging matters in the interest of Germanicus. **Tacitus** (*An.* **2**, 55) treats these charges as being to the detriment of army discipline, but adds, that "some even of the good soldiers were prompt in their undue subserviency because of a secret rumor that these things were not unacceptable to the emperor." If so, we may feel sure that they did not cause deterioration of discipline.

[119] According to Suetonius (*Tiberius*, 49) the wealth of Vonones caused his murder. It would, of course, prove very convenient in making arrangements for a rebellion.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE, A. D. 19–70.

§ 1. *A. D.* 19, 20. *Conversions to Judaism become Illegal.*

THE preparations for rebellion against Tiberius, mentioned in our last chapter, had been about consummated at the beginning of the present year. The plan, so far as it can be inferred from the actions of those concerned in it, was as follows. Germanicus, under his authorization from the Senate, was to drive out from his uncle's provinces[1] the appointees of his uncle, and was to establish in those provinces a kingdom for himself. The aristocracy at Rome meanwhile were, in the first place, to drive out, under different pretexts, those likely to take his uncle's part, and were then to re-establish the unlimited control of the Senate as it had existed in times of patrician supremacy.

The forces of Germanicus consisted probably of such troops as the senatorial faction could furnish from its own provinces, and of auxiliaries from the Arabian king who had crowned him, from the Armenian faction whose king he had crowned, and, last but not least, from the Parthian king. In Egypt, which lay at a distance from Parthia and from the senatorial provinces, he made no headway, notwithstanding his efforts to gain favor with the inhabitants.[2] In Syria he drove out his uncle's deputy, but

[1] See division of provinces mentioned in Ch. VII. note 115.

[2] Germanicus, according to Tacitus (*An.* **2**, 59), divested himself of his Roman dress and adopted that of the Greeks. He also, as mentioned by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* **8**, 71, 1; *al.* 46), consulted the Egyptian divinity Apis, the sacred bull. The former procedure suggests a question whether Germanicus held forth that his kingdom was to be a Grecian rather than a Roman one. His visit to Apis is (intentionally ?) omitted by Tacitus. It may well have seemed incongruous that the aristocracy should persecute Egyptianism at Rome whilst their leader sought its favor in Egypt.

was not long afterwards carried off by an illness. The efforts of Tacitus to prevent a comprehension of his actions are given below.[3] Piso at once returned with such forces as he could collect.[4] The Parthian king, though writing abusively to Tiberius,[5] must have been conquered and compelled to give hostages.[6]

At Rome one or both of the consuls were of the ultra-patrician school. The new year was welcomed by one of them with a blast from his trumpet,[7] in anticipation, as it would seem, of military deeds. Apprehension as to the result must have been general, for a couplet was sung in the streets[7a] as Sibylline: —

Their action may have taken place after failure by him to enlist Egyptian aid.

[3] "Germanicus returning from Egypt found his commands to legions or cities annulled or reversed. Hence serious insults [were heaped by him] on Piso, nor did the latter exert himself with less asperity against Germanicus. From that time (?) Piso determined to quit Syria. . . . There were found on the floor and walls [of Germanicus, who is represented as having fallen ill] exhumed remnants of human bodies, verses and magic cursings and the name of Germanicus cut into leaden tablets, half-burnt ashes smeared with gore, and other evil doings by which souls are reputedly devoted to the infernal powers. . . . Germanicus heard of these things with no less anger than fear. . . . He wrote [to Piso], renouncing his friendship. MOST ADD, that he commanded him to leave the province. Nor did Piso delay longer." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 69, 70. This seems to be the nearest approach to an apology which Tacitus can frame for the treason of Germanicus in seizing Syria and forcibly driving out the prefect whom his uncle had, so far as there was any constitution at Rome, constitutionally appointed.

[4] Piso wrote to Tiberius that, "driven out to make room for revolution, he had redirected his steps to take charge of the army, prompted by the same fidelity wherewith he had previously exercised his command." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 78. His efforts to strengthen his forces are mentioned in the same chapter.

[5] Suetonius, *Tib.* 66.

[6] A king was subsequently (Dio Cass. **58**, 26) selected by the Parthians from among these hostages. The Parthian hostages mentioned by Suetonius (*Calig.* 19) must have been these sent in the time of Tiberius. No subsequent occurrence had called for them.

[7] Dio Cass. **57**, 18. [7a] Ibid.

"When thrice three hundred years shall have passed
Internal sedition, the Sybaritic madness, shall destroy the Romans."

As a first step towards crippling Tiberius, the Senate expelled the Jews and their converts from Rome or Italy, after having impressed four thousand of their younger men and shut them up in Sardinia,[8] an island under senatorial control, where they would be unavailable for the popular party. The Senate also instituted an inquisition which, as we may infer from the fears of Seneca's father, must have been unsparing, touching any who held Jewish views,[9] and we can safely infer that it would have

---

[8] "Action was also held touching expulsion of the Egyptian and Jewish religions, and a decree was enacted by the Senate, 'that four thousand FREEDMEN of suitable age, who were INFECTED with that [the Jewish] superstition, should be deported to the island of Sardinia to restrain the robbers there, and, if they perished by the severity of the climate, the loss would be a cheap one; that the others should quit ITALY, unless before a fixed day they had renounced their profane rites.' " — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 85. If the former "perished" it was probably by murder.

Some of these freedmen, instead of being born Jews, may originally have been Gentiles. Dio Cassius says: "I do not know whence this appellation (Jews) originated, but IT APPLIES TO SUCH OTHER MEN AS ARE DEVOTED TO THEIR INSTITUTIONS, EVEN IF FROM OTHER NATIONS." — **Dio Cass. 37**, 17.

Tiberius "repressed foreign ceremonies [namely], Egyptian and Jewish rites, compelling such as were under control of that [the Egyptian?] superstition to burn their sacred vestments with all their apparatus. He distributed the young men of the Jews under guise of a military conscription into provinces WHERE THE CLIMATE WAS SEVERE. The others of that race, or proselytes to their views, *similia sectantes*, he removed from THE CITY, under pain of perpetual servitude if they did not obey." — **Suetonius**, *Tib.* c. 36. The vestments burned must have been Egyptian. The Jewish priesthood, with its paraphernalia, was confined to Jerusalem. The synagogue service seems to have been devoid of show.

[9] The reader, while perusing the following, should bear in mind the statement in **Smith's** *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 307, col. 1, that, "of solid meat, pork seems [among the Romans] to have been the favorite dish," — a remark equally true of the Greeks. See the same work, p. 305, col. 2. Seneca, after explaining that when he was a young man a certain Sotion, a disciple of Pythagoras, had persuaded him to give up animal food, con-

shown little or no justice to political opponents. Tiberius at once exerted himself to protect the Jews, in such provinces as he controlled.

Josephus mentions as the cause of Jewish expulsion an incident utterly insufficient to justify such wholesale proscription.[10] If it occurred, whether by preconcert or not, of patrician agents, it must have been merely a pretext, not the reason for expulsion. It is not mentioned by Tacitus or Suetonius, and may be merely a fiction by the Jewish aristocracy in exculpation of their patrician allies. The alleged occurrence at an Egyptian temple, also

---

tinues: "At the expiration of a year the custom was not only easy but pleasant to me. I believed my mind to be more active, though at present I would not affirm whether it were so or not. Do you ask why I gave it up? [The answer is that] I was a young man in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar. OTHER-RACE religious observances were at that time in course of expulsion, and among the proofs of [adhesion to foreign] superstition was regarded abstinence from the flesh of certain animals. When, therefore, I was requested by my father, who feared calumny, though he had no distaste for philosophy, I returned to my former way of life. Neither had he much difficulty in persuading me to commence with better fare." —**Seneca**, *Epistle* 108, §§ 21, 22.

[10] "There was a man who was a Jew, but had been driven away from his own country by an accusation laid against him for transgressing their laws and by the fear he was under of punishment for the same; but in all respects a wicked man. He, then living at Rome, professed to instruct men in the wisdom of the laws of Moses. He procured also three other men, entirely of the same character with himself, to be his partners. These men persuaded Fulvia, a woman of great dignity, and one that had embraced the Jewish religion, to send purple and gold to the temple at Jerusalem; and when they had gotten them, they employed them for their own uses, and spent the money themselves; on which account it was that they at first required it of her. Whereupon Tiberius [?] (who had been informed of the thing by Saturninus, the husband of Fulvia, at his wife's solicitation) ordered everything Jewish to be banished out of Rome; at which time THE CONSULS listed [impressed] four thousand men out of them, and sent them to the island of Sardinia; but punished a greater number of them, who were unwilling to become soldiers, on account of keeping the laws of their forefathers. Thus were these Jews banished out of the city by the wickedness of four men." —**Josephus**, *Antiq.* **18**, 3, 5, Whiston's trans. altered. Compare Ch. II. § 11. 2.

narrated by Josephus alone,[11] has, after due allowance for feminine credulity and heathen immorality, an improbable look. Any unpreconcerted coincidence of the two events with each other and with a political crisis of patricianism is utterly unlikely. Josephus and Suetonius ascribe Jewish expulsion to Tiberius. This would imply that he expelled his political friends and placed them in Sardinia, under control of his political enemies, — a supposition which defies credence. The penalty affixed to residence in the city by a Jew or convert to Judaism was, as already quoted from Suetonius, perpetual slavery. The severe (?) climate of Sardinia and the repression of robbers there are intended probably to divert the reader's attention from the true object of the conscription.

Coincident with anti-Jewish legislation the patricians had arranged a testimonial of increased devotion towards those institutions which they were desperately trying to uphold. Occia, a Vestal Virgin, had died; how long previously we are not told. Her office (see Ch. VII. note 95) had already, in the days of Augustus, lost its attractions. But heathen customs needed to be upheld as a support to patricianism. Zeal for party overrode parental affection. Two apparently prominent patricians had arranged to offer each a daughter. The choice between them was not decided by lot, but by considerations which raise the following questions. Had Jewish influence nurtured among Romans an idea that absence of divorce was a qualification for religious office? And was an anti-Jewish Senate influenced by a moral consideration, whose PROMINENCE in the community was attributable to Jewish teaching?[12]

---

[11] Josephus gives the details in his *Antiquities*, **18**, 3, 4. The husband of Paulina, equally as of Fulvia, is by Josephus called Saturninus.

[12] "After which things [namely, the anti-Jewish provisions] Cæsar laid before the Senate, 'that a virgin was to be selected in the place of Occia, who during fifty-seven years had presided with the greatest sanctity over the Vestal observances'; and he [?] gave thanks to Fonteius Agrippa and Domitius Pollio, that by offering their daughters they had vied in good offices toward the Republic [the Senate?]. The daughter

An incident which can only by conjecture be connected with the cause of monotheism and popular rights is remanded to a note.[13]

The rebellion at the East had been thwarted largely through Piso's activity. The chagrined aristocracy determined to wreak their vengeance on him. Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus, disappointed of royalty, brought back, in no amiable mood,[14] the ashes of her husband in a pompous funeral procession to Rome. The aristocracy exerted themselves to make capital out of the occasion.

Tiberius sent two pretorian cohorts to escort his nephew's remains; but neither he nor the mother of Germanicus, nor yet the grandmother, a partisan in most things of the aristocracy, attended the funeral. All saw that it had become a mere political manifestation with a criminal object.

The funeral occurred early in A. D. 20. At a subsequent

---

of Pollio was preferred, solely because of her mother never having been divorced; for Agrippa by a separation had lowered [the standing of] his house." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 86. The foregoing attributes to Tiberius a limited manifestation of respect towards heathen rites, which is rendered improbable by his known tendencies and yet more by the political significance, hostile to himself, which any effort towards re-establishing heathen religious customs must then have had. The truthfulness of Tacitus is inadequate evidence of sympathy by Tiberius with the action.

[13] Titidius Labeo was summoned to answer (Tacitus, *An.* **2**, 85) the charge of undue lenity to his wife. If she acted as alleged he would have been entitled to commiseration rather than prosecution. If, on the other hand, heedless words had by the ingenuity of party malice been distorted into a confession of crime, then a gross wrong was perpetrated towards her, that a blow might be aimed at her husband. Heathen dissoluteness prevents her alleged conduct from being incredible. The name of Labeo, however, and the vindictiveness of party strife, suggest that some son of the celebrated jurist may, in this, have been persecuted for services rendered by his father to the cause of human right.

[14] Agrippina seems to have been ambitious and vindictive, as we may infer from the advice to her which Tacitus (*An.* **2**, 72) attributes to her husband, from the remark to her of Tiberius (Sueton. *Tib.* 53), and from his letter (Tac. *An.* **5**, 3), and from her connection with the rebellion of A. D. 31, as also from remarks found in Tacitus, *An.* **4**, 39, 52, 53.

date Piso arrived, and was escorted by friends to his house. On the day after his arrival prosecution (under the Roman system of private prosecutors[15]) was commenced against him by Fulcinius Trio, who, eleven years later, reappears, conjointly with Agrippina, as leader of the aristocracy in another rebellion against Tiberius. For some reason, however, it must have been deemed judicious to withdraw Trio and substitute other accusers. Before a regular tribunal the Senate would have been defeated, but by some stretch of power it had the case brought before itself. Thus Piso's enemies were to be his judges. By what procedure the trial was removed from an ordinary court into the Senate[16] does not appear.

A mob, organized of course by the opposite faction, seized Piso's statues and hurried with them towards the place for executed criminals. A file of soldiers, who must have received orders from Tiberius, rescued the statues promptly and replaced them where they had previously stood.

The Senate condemned Piso to death.[17] He committed

---

[15] See Appendix, Note C.

[16] Compare on p. 112 note 119. A similar transfer of trial took place in the British House of Commons when the South Sea scheme fell through. "It was not found possible by any process of legal punishment to pursue with due pains and penalties. . . . The Houses of Parliament . . . made the directors bring in an account of their property and estates . . . and . . . fined them at their pleasure." — **Smyth**, *Lect. on Mod. Hist.* Vol. **2**, pp. 259, 260, Am. edit. These directors were not, as Piso, punished for allegiance to duty.

The usual tribunal (Tac. *An.* **2**, 79) would seem to have been a pretor's court. Tacitus (*An.* **3**, 10) narrates that proceedings were first commenced before the consuls. These were dropped. Tiberius was asked to sit as judge, for the prince, by virtue of his office, had, since its origin in the days of Augustus, judicial power. The request came doubtless from friends of Piso, though Tacitus puts it into such connection as favors an opposite conclusion. Tiberius declined, and, as misrepresented by Tacitus (*An.* **3**, 10), REFERRED THE MATTER TO THE SENATE.

[17] Suetonius, *Calig.* c. 2. The only real charge against Piso was that he had poisoned Germanicus. The evidence of this, according to Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* **11**, 71, 2), was the following. The heart of a poisoned person

suicide after having requested by letter the exertions of Tiberius in behalf of his children.[18] Tiberius, whose questions betoken painful interest in the fate of his friend,[19] exerted himself at once in behalf of his family and against the motion to erase his name from the annals, that is, from the list of consuls.[20] Tacitus would have us believe that Tiberius during the trial looked grave or indifferent, and, therefore, Piso committed suicide.[21]

The aristocracy, as we may infer from Dio Cassius, pushed their success and involved some of Piso's friends, or of their own enemies, in his fate.[22] This sequence

---

could not, according to the allegation of Piso's accusers, be burned. The fire which consumed the body of Germanicus did not consume his heart; therefore he must have been poisoned. Even Tacitus allows (*An.* **3**, 14) that the charge was not proved.

Other accusations of war against the provinces and the allies must have meant simply that Piso, when attacked, defended himself and maintained the authority of Tiberius against the Senate in provinces which for fifty years had been under jurisdiction, not of the latter, but of the prince. Compare note 25.

[18] Tacitus, *An.* **3**, 16.

[19] "Cæsar, putting on an expression of grief, [said to Piso's freedman who (Tac. *An.* **3**, 15) had been intrusted with the letter] that he (Piso) had by such a death INVITED disgrace on himself at the hands of the Senate. Then by repeated inquiries he sought out in detail what kind of a day and night Piso's last had been." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **3**, 16. The character of Tiberius (see note G) is a guaranty that grief, if manifested, was felt. The remark to the freedman is probably a fiction; its object being to conceal the fact that Piso had already been condemned.

[20] Tacitus, *An.* **3** 17, 18.

[21] "Piso, having suffered from renewed accusation, [had it been intermitted or decided once in his favor?] from hostile voices of the Fathers and from all adverse and threatening circumstances, was utterly frightened by nothing so much as by seeing Tiberius without [evidence of] commiseration or anger. . . . At daybreak he was found [in his chamber], his throat cut, his sword lying on the ground." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **3**, 15.

[22] "In retaliation for the death of Germanicus many were destroyed on the charge that they had rejoiced at it." — **Dio Cassius, 57**, 18. The connection attributes these murders to Tiberius; but after his death all murders perpetrated in his reign by the senatorial faction were, by that

of the trial is ignored, or concealed, by Tacitus,[23] who, though acquainted with the views of the popular party concerning Germanicus,[24] has given us merely patrician statements, or his own fictions and discolorations.[25] One of his boldest efforts at untruth is the statement under A. D. 23, that, during the reign of Tiberius prior to that date, the Republic had been *compositam*, "free from disturbance."

In the management of accusations against Piso or others of the popular party it is probable that the established institution of *Prosecutors on shares* must have showed some

---

faction, attributed to him. Compare, in Appendix, Note G, foot-note 114.

[23] **Tacitus,** after mentioning rewards to the prosecutors, alleges: "This was the end of [proceedings in] revenge for the death of Germanicus." — *An.* **3,** 19.

[24] **Tacitus** says concerning the death of Germanicus, under which he includes apparently what preceded and followed it: "Even in subsequent times diverse views of it had currency. Points of the highest importance are in doubt, because some treat mere hearsay as certainty, while others reverse the truth." — *An.* **3,** 19.

[25] Tacitus (*An.* **3,** 12) attributes to Tiberius a remark, that if Piso had failed in respect towards Germanicus, this was a matter for himself to resent, not as prince but as a private individual. If Tiberius uttered the remark, it meant, doubtless, that such disrespect was no matter for judicial cognizance.

The following statements attributed to Tiberius must be outright fabrications. That only the wisdom of Germanicus could manage matters at the East (Tac. *An.* **2,** 43); that he had by authorization of the Senate sent Piso thither as a [subordinate] coadjutor to Germanicus (Tac. *An.* **3,** 12); that he promised rewards to the prosecutors of Piso (Tac. *An.* **3,** 19). Equally fabricated must be the expressions professedly copied from Piso's letter to Tiberius: "Divine Augustus"; "my wickedness." Piso was writing to one who knew him to be innocent.

The meanest insinuation is one which Tacitus (*An.* **3,** 16) does not pretend to have found recorded anywhere, namely, that Piso had not committed suicide, but been assassinated by an emissary of Tiberius. Tacitus remembered to have heard this from *senioribus* persons of a former generation whose names he does not give. Compare, in the Appendix, Note G, § v. as to his untruthfulness.

of its worst features, for a commission was appointed to remedy its evils.[26]

§ II. *A. D.* 21-37.

During that portion of the reign of Tiberius which is after A. D. 19, our knowledge of Judaism at Rome is quite indirect. We may safely assume that moral sense could not approve expulsion, or servitude, of well-behaved citizens because of their belief; and if Jews were the mechanics of that day, that the industrial wants of the community, no less than the politics of the popular party, would powerfully co-operate with moral sense. It is not strange, therefore, that the aristocracy were at once put upon the defensive and needed to ransack antiquity for the semblance of precedent.[27] Absence of disturbance in Judea during the whole reign of Tiberius (Tac. *Hist.* **5,** 9) must have been due to confidence in himself, not to confidence in the Senate.

---

[26] Tacitus, *An.* **3,** 28. Compare Appendix, Note C.

[27] **Valerius Maximus,** in a work issued during the reign of Tiberius, devotes a chapter (Book **1,** c. 3) to the instances in which a foreign religion had been rejected, *de peregrina religione rejecta.* Under three heads he mentions five instances. 1. Bacchanal orgies, after being carried to excess, had been abolished; and "Lutatius, who finished the first Punic war, was forbidden by the Senate to consult the oracle of Fortune at Præneste, for they decided that the Republic ought to be administered according to its own, not according to foreign, divination." 2. Cornelius Hispallus, "pretor for foreigners," had given the astrologers ten days in which to leave the city and Italy. The same man had sent "to their homes [in the city?] those who by a PRETENDED worship of Sabazian Jove endeavored to corrupt Roman customs." 3. A temple of Isis and Serapis had been destroyed.

To class astrology as a foreign religion, or astrologers as a religious sect, seems a stretch of language. It was, perhaps, the only means of finding a precedent for expelling religionists from the city, or from Italy. On Jewish connection with astrology, see pp. 37, 38.

The derivation of the term "Sabazian Jove" is uncertain. If it were a corruption for Jove Sabaoth, or Jove Sabatticus, we might reasonably infer that in B. C. 139, when Cornelius Scipio Hispallus was pretor (see Scipio, No. 28, in Smith, *Dict. of Biog.*), some (foreigners) at Rome had mixed Judaism with heathenism.

As regards heathenism we can see that the reactionary spasm had done it no service. Temples had been multiplied. The conservative reaction of A. D. 19 may have furnished a PRETEXT for erecting new ones, but the following causes were also probably efficient. A criminal, a debtor, or a slave who took refuge in a temple could not be taken thence by pursuers. Very numerous classes in the community, therefore, were interested in encouraging and aiding this multiplication of asylums.[28] A fraternity of thieves would inevitably be among the most pious and outspoken in their devotion to temple building. A senatorial investigation during A. D. 22 into the claims of different temples merely opened the floodgates of fable and deluged the Senate with traditions which its orthodoxy must have been puzzled either to accept or reject, and which exhausted patience.[29] If the monotheistic and popular party had devised a plan for weakening heathenism and exposing it to contempt, they could hardly have invented a better one than such an investigation.

Heathen deities took, according to prevalent ideas, no interest in moral offences of man against man, but were sure to resent insult to themselves, whether by taking a man from their altars, or otherwise; therefore, what the heathens miscalled RELIGION, was LEGITIMATELY accountable for prevailing evils. So far as the conservative reaction of A. D. 19 stimulated erection of temples, it contributed towards exposing the true character of heathenism. The motive of the Senate in limiting the right of its deities to grant an asylum was less probably a desire of shielding the community against criminals than of securing themselves against slaves. Some of the latter,

---

[28] "The temples were filled with the worst classes of slaves. There persons loaded with debt took refuge against creditors. So did those suspected of capital crimes, nor was any power so efficient in restraining popular sedition, or human wickedness, as the divine ceremonies were in protecting them." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **3,** 60.

[29] "The Fathers, weary with the quantity [of embassies concerning temples] and with the earnestness of the strife, intrusted [the whole matter with some limitations] to the consuls." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **3,** 63.

while protected by the statue of the "Divine Augustus," had abused their masters,[30] to the amusement perhaps of the popular party. Deference to the divinity of Augustus would be severely tested in not ordering their seizure.

In A. D. 23 two occurrences show the downward tendency of the old religion. The Senate needed to vote a heavy pecuniary gratuity to one of the vestal virgins, and a seat among them at the theatre to the emperor's mother,[31] as a means of diminishing repugnance towards the office. Another event of the same year calls for a prefatory remark.

Twelve months before this, Servius Maluginensis, priest of Jupiter, had claimed the province of Asia,[32] under, as it would seem, a rule of the Senate, that the oldest consular senator, that is, the one who had longest ago held the consulship, should be entitled to that province. The rule was the only resource perhaps against strife between greedy aspirants. An examination of law showed that the priest of Jupiter must not leave Rome for more than a night or two at a time, and Asia was awarded to the next oldest consular.[33] This legal discovery was likely enough to terminate all ambition for this priesthood. Patrician zeal for heathenism had no intention of sacrificing a governor's perquisites in Asia for the empty dignity of being Jupiter's priest.

Maluginensis was now (A. D. 23) dead, and the Senate made some abatement from old usage, that the office might find an incumbent.[34] The son of Maluginensis was

---

[30] Tacitus, *An.* **3**, 36.

[31] Tacitus, *An.* **4**, 16.

[32] Tacitus, *An.* **3**, 58. Augustus or the aristocracy revived, in B. C. 11, during the reactionary efforts of that date, the priesthood of Jupiter, which had been out of existence for seventy-six years. Since that date Servius Maluginensis had been the only incumbent.

[33] Tacitus, *An.* **3**, 71. The incumbent had been thirty-three years in office without knowledge of this rule. Obviously neither he nor others had given it a thought until a monetary reason for its consideration arose.

[34] Tacitus saves senatorial orthodoxy by attributing to Tiberius the proposal for modifying ancient usage.

temporarily substituted *suffectus* in his father's place.[35] Sixteen years later, in A. D. 39, a question touching the priest of Jupiter seems to imply that this son, or some one else, was then in office; but, with this exception, the priest of Jupiter disappears from history.

In A. D. 24 augury, the only relic of what might be called public religious service at Rome, came to an end.[36] It was not revived during a quarter of a century. The public or patrician religion was wholly disconnected from morality, benevolence, or hopes of a future life, and with its extinguishment not a soul would in these respects have felt itself worse off.[37] It had been upheld by a political faction merely for political objects. Its temporary death did not prevent prosecutions for unbelief against members of the popular party, a noteworthy instance of which will reappear in our next section.

The plottings of the aristocracy against Tiberius, and their rebellion in A. D. 31, are not historically connected with monotheism, except by prosecutions for unbelief against persons whose names, with one exception, have not been preserved. An account of this rebellion will be found in the Appendix, Note G, § III.

In A. D. 32 a production in the name of Sibylla was added to the public collection.[38] This may indicate that the rebellion of A. D. 31, equally as that of A. D. 19, 20, was followed by reaction against the old religion.

---

[35] Tacitus, *An.* **4**, 16. Compare the use of *suffectus* in the consular lists.

[36] In A. D. 49, augury, according to Tacitus (*An.* **12**, 23), had been disused for twenty-five years. Compare touching it an extract from Strabo with comments, on pp. 175, 176. Strabo calls it "Etruscan divination."

[37] If Christian churches were without teaching, mere refuge-places for crime or misfortune, into which no officer of the law dare intrude, they would in so far resemble heathen temples.

[38] Tacitus, *An.* **6**, 12. Compare Appendix, Note A, foot-note 120.

§ III. *A. D.* 37–41. *Caligula.*

1. HIS CHARACTER.

The character of Caligula, equally as that of Tiberius, needs to be ascertained by sifting a mass of misrepresentation. A prominent trait in it was kindliness, with which impatience may sometimes, though not seriously, have interfered. This trait of kindliness belonged to him in childhood; and the appellation bestowed on him by the soldiery[39] of *Caligula*, that is, "*Little-Boots*," seems to have been one of affection. At his accession the multitude showered upon him the epithets, not of servility nor yet of deference towards a superior, but of endearment[40] as towards a loved child. His illness caused widespread sympathy,[41] unless among the aristocracy, and after his

---

[39] "It was to the pleasantry of the soldiers in camp that he owed the name of Caligula. . . . How much his education amongst them recommended him to their favor and affection was sufficiently apparent in the mutiny upon the death of Augustus, when the mere sight of him appeased their fury, though it had risen to a great height. For they persisted in it, until they observed that he was sent away to a neighboring city, to secure him against all danger. Then, at last, they began to relent, and, stopping the chariot in which he was conveyed, earnestly deprecated the odium to which such a proceeding would expose them." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* c. 9, Bohn's trans. altered.

[40] Sueton. *Calig.* 13. Epithets of this nature scarcely admit translation. Compare on p. 224, popular love for him after his death.

[41] "Accordingly, when the news was spread abroad that he was sick, . . . every house and every city became full of depression and melancholy. . . . When his disease began to abate, in a very short time even the men who were living on the very confines of the empire heard of it and rejoiced, . . . every city was full of suspense and expectation, being continually eager for better news, . . . each thinking the health of Caius to be his own salvation; and this feeling pervaded every continent and every island, for no one can recollect so great and general a joy affecting any one country or any one nation, at the good health or prosperity of their governor, as now pervaded the whole of the habitable world at the recovery of Caius." — **Philo,** *Embassy to Caius*, c. 3, Bohn's trans. (Paris edit. pp. 682, 683). The foregoing is from Caligula's enemy. "When

death the senatorial faction which had prompted could not protect his murderers. His kindheartedness did not diminish with years. When public amusement had caused murder, he gave vent to his feelings at its inhumanity.[42] He must have concluded that to such a set even sham fights were harmful, for he sold off the remaining gladiators.[43] He seems, however, to have catered liberally for public amusement by shows of wild beasts[44] and by instituting theatricals in different parts of the city,[45] in hopes perhaps of reclaiming the multitude from more brutal tastes.

The sale of his valuables was due doubtless to the above trait. He had visited the army in Gaul more than a year before his death, and must have found there the customary evil of soldiers cheated and plundered by their officers; an evil wherewith better administrative abilities than his have been puzzled to cope, and from which some modern European armies are by no means free. He thereupon transported to Lyons the valuables collected in his palace, sold them at auction, and used the proceeds for

---

he fell ill, the people hung about the Palatium all night long; some vowed, in public hand-bills, to risk their lives in the combats of the amphitheatre, and others to lay them down, for his recovery."—**Sueton.** *Calig.* c. 14, Bohn's trans.

Josephus, amidst some contradictory statements, says of Caligula, that "he was also more skilful in persuading others to very great things than any one else, and this from a NATURAL AFFABILITY OF TEMPER which had been improved by much exercise and painstaking."—**Josephus,** *Antiq.* **19,** 2, 5, Whiston's trans. And mentions (*Ibid.*) that he "was a slave to the commendations of the populace"; with which remark, however, compare the last paragraph of note 72.

[42] See Sueton. *Calig.* 30, cited in Ch. V. note 7.

[43] Dio Cass. **59,** 14. Compare Sueton. *Calig.* 39 (or in Bohn's trans. 38).

[44] Dio Cass. **59,** 13; compare **59,** 7.

[45] "He frequently entertained the people with stage-plays of various kinds and in several parts of the city."—**Sueton.** *Calig.* 18, Bohn's trans. "At first he was a spectator and listener, joining in approbation or disapprobation as if he were one of the crowd; subsequently . . . he did not go to the theatre."—**Dio Cass. 59,** 5. His relative Pomponius strove (Pliny, *Jun.* **7,** 17, 11) to make these a success.

his soldiers,[46] cashiering at the same time not a few centurions who had either been peculating,[47] or engaged in conspiracy against himself.

His directions to the soldiery after a parade, that they should collect spoils from the ocean, namely, its shells,[48] meant evidently that he wished them to have a good time and enjoy themselves. The procedure was followed by a donation to each of them.

Affectionateness is rarely lacking in a kindly disposition, and in Caligula the affections seem to have been strong.[49] If his selection of a seat for his infant daughter be a true indication of his aims in her behalf, then affectionateness was mingled with true aspirations.

Another prominent feature in Caligula was a keen appreciation of the ludicrous, and a tendency to give humorous rather than correct reasons for his conduct. Thus for a practical and sufficient reason he enclosed a

---

[46] "Sending for the most beautiful and expensive of the princely valuables, he sold them at auction. . . . Yet he did not lay up anything but expended it on — aside from other things — . . . the armies." — **Dio Cass. 59,** 21, 22. The context specifies articles received from his father and mother, from his grandfather and great-grandfathers. Suetonius (*Calig.* 39) treats the sale as consisting of furniture from the old palace *aula*, and gives an exaggerated, or perhaps fabricated, account of inconvenience suffered at Rome by abstraction of teams to transport it.

[47] "He deprived of their companies most of the centurions of the first rank, who had now served their legal time in the wars, and some whose time would have expired in a few days; alleging against them their age and infirmity [?]; and railing at the covetous disposition of the rest of them." — **Suetonius,** *Calig.* c. 44, Bohn's trans.

[48] Sueton. *Calig.* c. 46.

[49] "He loved with a most passionate and constant affection [his wife] Cæsonia, who was neither handsome nor young." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 25, Bohn's trans. The same is implied in his eccentric remark (Sueton. *Calig.* 33), that he would have to put her to the torture to ascertain what made him love her so. He is mentioned (Sueton. *Calig.* 25) as carrying, outside of home, his infant child; and the fact that he placed her in the lap of Minerva, rather than in that of any other goddess, indicates perhaps his wishes in her behalf. Compare Suetonius, *Calig.* 25, with Dio Cassius, **59,** 28, and Josephus, *Antiq.* **19,** 1, 2.

passage from his domicile to the temple of Castor and Pollux. His assigned reason for so doing was, that he might have them for door-keepers.[50] His feeble-minded uncle Claudius engaged in conspiracy against him, but, owing probably to good feeling in Caligula, was not punished. The statement of Suetonius, that he reserved him for a laughing stock,[51] may have been the reason assigned by his nephew.

Caligula's unsound nervous organization, combined with sleeplessness,[52] occasioned or aggravated impatience. He was aware of the tendency, for he regarded his child as inheriting it from himself.[53] This impatience may not only have mingled with his denunciation of aristocratic crime,[54] his utterances of contempt for aristocratic hobbies,[55] and

---

[50] On an edge of the Palatine Hill (Findlay's Atlas, map 2) stood the palace of Caligula. In the valley, at a distance of from two hundred to four hundred yards, was the *Roman Forum*. The difference in altitude was (see Smith, *Dict. of Geog.* Vol. **2**, p. 721, col. 2) less than one hundred feet. Between the two was the temple of Castor and Pollux, fronting towards the Forum and reached by a high flight of steps, from which orators sometimes (Smith, *Dict. of Geog.* Vol. **2**, p. 783, col. 2) addressed the multitude below. The temple was frequently used (Cicero, *In Verrem*, Act. **2**, Lib. 1, 49) for senatorial, and daily for judicial, business. Caligula, from motives of health or convenience, made a covered passage (Sueton. *Calig.* c. 22; Dio Cassius, **59**, 28), to this temple, and a doorway, if none previously existed, in its rear. It rendered attention to business in the temple, and, perhaps, access to the Forum, much easier. Caligula's frequent presence in the temple or its portico may have originated the story of his exhibiting himself between the two deities.

[51] Sueton. *Calig.* 23.

[52] Caligula was unable (Sueton. *Calig.* 50) to sleep more than three hours in a night and then not soundly.

[53] "He thought its excitability the surest proof that it was his child." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 25.

[54] See Appendix, Note G, foot-notes 96 and 114.

[55] The senatorial faction idolized Agrippa, who, under Augustus, had been its unscrupulous and successful leader. Caligula decried Agrippa, and wished no praise for being his grandson. The Senate worshipped Augustus, and, that it might sway Caligula to its purposes, employed a mob who should praise him (Dio Cass. **59**, 13) as the young Augustus.

of indignation at venal or partisan lawyers and courts,[56] but with his criticisms of things disconnected from politics.[57]

We cannot pronounce with the same certainty on the truth or falsity of each specific act or word attributed to an impulsive though good-hearted being, as we can in dealing with a well-balanced character. Careless utterances, with no other object than temporary amusement, were natural to such a disposition as Caligula's. These often needed but slight perversion to give them an appearance of seriousness and importance which they did not deserve. He may, in the earlier part of his reign, have humorously commented on it as not distinguished like that of his predecessors by any great calamity.[58]

Caligula, however, treated the victories of Augustus at Actium and Sicily as calamitous to the Roman PEOPLE. (See Sueton. *Calig.* 23; Dio Cass. **59,** 20.) He preferred to be considered a descendant of Antony rather than of Augustus; that is, a member of the popular rather than of the patrician party. The aristocracy already, perhaps, as at a later date, treated admiration of Homer as a test of heathen orthodoxy. Virgil's perversion of the Erythræan verses must have been grateful in their eyes. Caligula expressed contempt for both. "He had thoughts (?) . . . of suppressing Homer's poems. 'For why,' said he, 'may I not do what Plato has done before me, who excluded him from his commonwealth?' He was likewise very near (?) banishing the writings and the busts of Virgil and Livy from all libraries; censuring one of them as 'a man of no genius and very little learning'; and the other as 'a verbose and careless historian.'" — **Sueton.** *Calig.* c. 34, Bohn's trans.

[56] "He often talked of the lawyers as if he intended to abolish their profession. 'By Hercules!' he would say, 'I shall put it out of their power to answer any questions in law, otherwise than by referring to me!'" — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 34, Bohn's trans. The circumstance most likely to have prompted these remarks was as follows: The lawyers seem to have hunted up precedent or authority for *compelling* condemned persons to murder each other; see note 72, and Ch. V. notes 8, 9.

[57] When Caligula found the roads under Vespasian's care coated with mud he gave vent to his feelings in the utterance: Stuff his pockets with it (Dio Cass. **59,** 12; Sueton. *Vespas.* 5), or, more literally, "his bosom," which the Romans used for a pocket. Seneca was admired. Caligula treated his language as "sand without lime." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 53.

[58] "He used also to complain aloud of the state of the times, because

He may, when building a dwelling near the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus,[59] have indulged in some pleasantry about messing with him, or may, in a humorous moment, have addressed him some question and pretended to listen for an answer;[60] yet the offensive portions of his sayings, and all, or nearly all, the cruelties and vices attributed to him, must be fabrications or misrepresentations. Seneca, though over-willing to disparage him, nowhere, I think, attributes to him personal vices or crimes.

The public improvements which Caligula planned, or executed, are, to a degree at least, evidence of laudable aims,[61] while his personal superintendence of workmen,[62]

---

it was not rendered remarkable by any public calamities; for, while the reign of Augustus had been made memorable to posterity by the disaster of Varus, and that of Tiberius by the fall of the theatre at Fidenæ, his was likely to pass into oblivion from an uninterrupted series of prosperity." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 31, Bohn's trans.

[59] Caligula lived on one hill and the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, in which the Senate usually met, was on another. He first "united the palace and Capitol by a bridge thrown above the temple of the divine Augustus. Afterwards, that he might be nearer [to senatorial business], he laid the foundations of a new dwelling in the Capitoline area." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 22.

[60] Caligula "chatted secretly with Jupiter Capitolinus, sometimes whispering and then in turn holding his ear, then speaking in a louder tone and occasionally disputing with him, . . . until over-urged, as he alleged, and voluntarily invited to become [Jupiter's] tent-fellow." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 22.

[61] "He completed the works which were left unfinished by Tiberius, namely, the temple of Augustus and the theatre of Pompey. He began, likewise, the aqueduct from the neighborhood of Tibur, and an amphitheatre near the Septa. . . . The walls of Syracuse, which had fallen to decay by length of time, he repaired, as he likewise did the temples of the gods. He formed plans for rebuilding the palace of Polycrates at Samos, finishing the temple of the Didymæan Apollo at Miletus, and building a town on a ridge of the Alps; but, above all, for cutting through the isthmus in Achaia; and even sent a centurion of the first rank to measure out the work." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 21, Bohn's trans. On visiting the Gallic sea-coast, in the neighborhood probably of Boulogne, he erected (Sueton. *Calig.* 46) a lighthouse.

[62] Philo mentions (*Embassy to Caius,* 45, Paris edit. pp. 732, lines

and his attention at judicial tribunals or in the Senate,[63] indicate industry which approximated, and perhaps equalled, his physical capacity. His administrative ability may not have been very high, and his expenditure, in one instance, seems, at least, like extravagance.[64] Yet, in judging his financial management, discrimination should be exercised between his own drains on his treasury and the thefts from it which illness, inexperience, or lack of special gifts disabled him from preventing. Treasury thieves were thankful after his death to find in his alleged disbursements the sole explanation of his empty treasury.[65] In judging his character, facts, which seem credible, should be carefully dissociated from the interpretation affixed to them by his enemies.

2. ORDER OF EVENTS IN HIS REIGN.

Caligula's reign is no longer extant in the Annals of Tacitus. The order of its events may, even if imperfectly

---

26–29, 733, lines 8–11) that Caligula, while listening to him and his opponents, was superintending work then under way in the palace. Compare later exaggerations and fictions in Suetonius, *Calig.* 37.

[63] Dio Cass. **59**, 18.

[64] "He made a bridge, of about three [Roman] miles and a half in length, from Baiæ to the mole of Puteoli, collecting trading vessels from all quarters, mooring them in two rows by their anchors, and spreading earth upon them to form a viaduct after the fashion of the Appian Way. This bridge he crossed and recrossed for two days together." — **Suetonius**, *Calig.* 19, Bohn's trans. Some practical reason, sufficient or insufficient, may have existed for this structure. He may have wished to test the applicability of floating bridges elsewhere in the empire. Some must have thought (Sueton. *Ibid.*) that he was testing their applicability to the Rhine.

[65] The alleged gift by Caligula to Antiochus of Commagene (Sueton. *Calig.* 16; compare Dio Cass. **60** 8) is one of the larger items invented by treasury thieves. Caligula found a full treasury at his accession, paid large legacies of Tiberius from it, and nine months afterwards (Dio Cass. **59**, 2) it was empty. The date was during, or at the close of, his dangerous illness, when his revenue from Egypt had, perhaps, been intercepted by the conspirators there. Yet shortly afterwards, in A. D. 38, when a large fire occurred, he had means to indemnify the sufferers.

stated, aid some readers and serve as a starting-point for subsequent inquirers.

A. D. 37. MARCH 17? OR 27? UNTIL IN AUGUST. Caligula utters a funeral oration on Tiberius; pays his legacies; brings home the remains of his own mother; burns the testimony of her accusers, who had also been her accomplices; effects, between contending factions, a truce, which includes cessation of trials for unbelief [in the heathen deities]; sets Herod at liberty. SEPTEMBER 1 TO DECEMBER 31, Caligula ill. Conspiracy of Herod and the Jewish aristocracy at Alexandria, prompted and supported by the Roman Senate, breaks out in October.[66] They kidnap Flaccus.

A. D. 38. Caligula in the beginning of the year still convalescent.[67] Philo's embassy to Caligula in midwinter. Macro intrusted with investigation and settlement of matters at Alexandria. Drusilla, sister of Caligula, dies. The conspiracy at Alexandria having been put down, its leaders are punished. Alexander, Philo's brother, put under arrest. Macro is *probably* assassinated by conspirators as a means of screening themselves.

A. D. 39. The patricians (to screen themselves) recommence prosecutions which had been suspended. Domitius Afer, a popular leader, prosecuted, but acquitted. Consuls at Rome (August 31) resign or are dismissed. Popular election resorted to. Domitius Afer elected consul. Senators charge against Tiberius the prosecutions instituted by themselves in his reign. Caligula convicts them from their own records. Leaves Rome (the same day?)[68] for

---

[66] Flaccus (cp. pp. 97, 100, 101) was kidnapped during the feast of tabernacles within a year from the death of Tiberius.

[67] Caligula was consul in 37, 39, 40, and 41, but not in 38. This accords with inability to assume that office on the first of January. The consuls, in their official oath (January 1), did not (Dio Cass. **59**, 9) include what Tiberius had established, perhaps because Caligula could not yet superintend matters.

[68] Caligula, after reproving the Senate, "went out the same day into the suburbs." — **Dio Cass. 59**, 16. "He did not foreannounce his departure, but, going into a suburb, he suddenly set out." — **Dio Cass. 59**, 21. Other events are interposed by Dio between these two.

the armies of Gaul and Germany. Goes for a time beyond the Rhine. Visits the north coast of Gaul.

A. D. 40. Caligula, January 1, is at Lyons.[69] Remains in Gaul, or its neighborhood, until about September. The aristocracy persecute the popular party and prepare for rebellion. Caligula returns to Rome about September.[70] Puts two or three conspirators or persecutors to death and banishes a considerable number. Aims at a more popular form of government.

A. D. 41. Caligula is murdered January 24.

Of the above events, the conspiracy, in A. D. 37, has been elsewhere narrated.[71] Later occurrences need a fuller statement. The death of Macro, though it removed the person best able to aid Caligula, did not free from danger the patrician instigators of what had occurred at Alexandria. To save themselves, they, as in A. D. 31, strove to intimidate opponents by prosecutions.[72]

---

[69] Sueton. *Calig.* 17.

[70] Suetonius (*Calig.* 49) says that he entered the city on his birthday, less than four months before he perished. His birthday was, according to Dio Cassius (**59**, 6), September 20. His death was January 24. A different account (Dio Cassius, **59**, 7; Sueton. *Calig.* 8) makes August 31 his birthday; but this would have been nearly five months before his death.

[71] See Ch. V. § VIII.

[72] A commencement of prosecutions must have been made (Dio Cassius, **59**, 10 and close of 11) in the latter part of A. D. 38. "In those days [January, A. D. 39] and subsequently many prominent men being condemned were punished; not a few of these, from among such as had [at the beginning of Caligula's reign] been set at liberty, [being now condemned] on the same charges on which they had been made prisoners in the time of Tiberius. Many of the others [the less distinguished] were put to death fighting duels [by compulsion]; and aside from murders nothing was taking place.

"[Caligula] conceded no favor to the multitude [the hired mob?], but [when it clamored for victims?] did the reverse of what it wished. . . . On one occasion, threatening the whole people [a euphemism for the mob], he said, '*I wish that* YOU *had but one neck.*'" — **Dio Cass. 59**, 13. The wish was prompted, not by cruelty, but by indignation at their bloodthirstiness.

Among their intended victims was Domitius Afer, a resolute popular leader and distinguished orator, who proved able to cope with and baffle them.[73]

The patricians seem to have employed a mob, which should clamor for what Caligula could not grant, that is, probably, for death, in the amphitheatre, of men condemned by patrician courts, or disagreeable to patricians. We are specially told that they clamored for "*prosecutors.*"[74]

The aristocracy had contrived indirect methods for swaying, if possible, Caligula to their purposes. The mob had been taught to call him the Young Augustus. His comment thereon has already been given.[75]

If arrogance, or love of adulation, had been strong in Caligula, he would have shown it in the contest now commenced, and of whose import he was fully aware.[76] Yet he evinces a singular freedom from such a trait. When rebuking the Senate for its misrepresentation of Tiberius, his words were: "Towards me, who am yet in office, such conduct might be permissible, but you are committing no ordinary injustice in thus maligning your former ruler."[77] At a later date he ordered that to the birthdays of Tiberius and Drusilla equal public respect should be shown as to that of Augustus;[78] but of respect

---

[73] "Among the accused was Domitius Afer, whose peril was unexpected, and his escape more wonderful." — **Dio Cass. 59,** 19. Compare, in regard to him, Tacitus, *An.* **4,** 52.

[74] **Dio Cass. 59,** 13. Compare, touching prosecutors, Appendix, Note C. Probably the prosecutors thus clamored for were acting on behalf of the popular party. It was doubtless in some such case or cases that Caligula commended (Sueton. *Calig.* 29) his own inflexibility.

[75] See note 55.

[76] After convicting the Senate of murders which it was charging upon Tiberius, Caligula represented the latter, though dead, as saying to him: "They [the senators] all hate you and desire your death" (**Dio Cass. 59,** 16); and in his subsequent letter from Gaul, "He wrote . . . to the Senate as if he had escaped a great conspiracy." — **Dio Cass. 59,** 23.

[77] **Dio Cass. 59,** 16.

[78] Dio Cass. **59,** 24. This meant that the feelings of the popular party should be respected equally as those of the patricians.

towards his own birthday he omits any mention. These are not the sayings of an arrogant or vainglorious man, and the veneration which he more than once showed for one so unlike himself in many respects as the Emperor Tiberius, should weigh not a little in determining his own aims and desires.

Caligula, in visiting, without prior notice, the armies of Gaul and Germany, was prompted by knowledge of a conspiracy already under way there, headed by members of his own family. Officers in those armies were in sympathy with it and needed elimination.[79] The common soldiers, as in A. D. 14, showed no predilection for aristocratic plans. Two sisters of Caligula — the two to whom he had not intrusted the government during his illness — were concerned in the rebellion, and were, on that account, banished.[80] Probably some of the Gallic aristocracy co-operated or had been co-operating with that of Rome.[81] When patricians gained power, after Caligula's death, they, though not immediately, elected members of the Gallic aristocracy to seats in the Senate.[82]

Whether at Rome during Caligula's absence the Senate attempted open rebellion is not clear. Its preparations had unquestionably been made. Among its acts of terrorism for intimidating the popular party, there is one of which the details are scanty, but it is almost the only prosecution in this reign of which any details whatever have been vouchsafed us.

Pomponius, a relative of Caligula, was a poet of culture and learning, an intimate friend of the elder Pliny, who wrote his life.[83] A remark of his biographer, *in-*

[79] Suetonius (*Calig.* 44) mentions the dismissal of officers, assigning, however, as reasons what must have been patrician misrepresentations.

[80] Sueton. *Calig.* 24; Dio Cass. **59**, 22.

[81] Caligula "murdered [?] some [in Gaul] as plotting revolution, others as conspirators against himself, . . . commanding the wealthiest of them [the Gauls] to be put to death." — **Dio Cass. 59**, 21, 22.

[82] Tacitus, *An.* **11**, 23–25. Compare the sympathy of the Jewish with the Roman aristocracy in Ch. V. § VIII.

[83] **Tacitus**, *An.* **5**, 8. Pliny, *Scn.*, *Nat. Hist.* **7**, 18, 3; Pliny, *Jun.* **3**, 5, 3. "In our times [A. D. 74] Pomponius Secundus fully equals

signia . . . cognoscuntur . . . in Pomponio consulari poeta nunquam ructasse, seems fairly to imply that his habits of eating and drinking must have been temperate. His

---

Domitius Afer in dignity or enduring fame."—**de Orator. Dial.** 13. Pliny mentions (**14**, 6, 3) having in his *Life of Pomponius* described a supper given by the latter to Caligula, *cœnamque quam Principi* [*Princeps?*] *illi dedit.* As this supper took place A. D. 40 or 41 (one hundred and sixty years after the consulship of L. Opimius), it may be a question whether some transcriber has not substituted *Principi* for *Princeps.* If so, the supper described by Pliny was the one given to Pomponius by Caligula. The former was at that date in no condition to make a feast. According to **Dio Cassius** (**59**, 29), Caligula "made a certain feast in the palace [in A. D. 41]. . . . Pomponius Secundus, then consul, was carried in at the moment when the provisions were placed on the table. Sitting [reclining?] at the feet of Caligula, and ἐπισκήπτων, leaning on them constantly, he tenderly kissed them." The fact that he was CARRIED in, and the fact mentioned by Seneca, that he was subsequently helpless to give himself a drink of water, suggest that he, equally as his wife or freedwoman, had been crippled by brutal treatment at the hands of his enemies.

The foregoing incident must be the one to which Seneca refers, though some copyist, misled by the abbreviation (Pomp.) has substituted another name, unless we assume two consular relatives of Caligula (one of them unknown to our present published consular lists) as both rescued from their enemies, and expressing their feelings in the same manner. "Caius Cæsar [that is, Caligula] granted life to Pompeius Pennus, — if he who does not take away can be regarded as giving; then to him [when] set at liberty and giving thanks, he extended his left foot to be kissed. Those who excuse it, and deny that it was prompted by insolence, say that he wished to show his gilded, or rather his golden, sock splendid with jewels. Be it so. What more shameful than that a CONSULAR man kissed gold and jewels?" — **Seneca,** *De Benefic.* **2**, 12, 1. His fate after the murder of his protector is elsewhere portrayed: "Are you richer than Pompeius, to whom — when Caius, previously his relative, latterly his host, had opened the home of Cæsar, that he might shut up his own — bread and water were wanting? When he owned so many streams rising and falling on his own property, he begged drops of water; he perished from hunger and thirst in the palace of his relative, whilst an heir gave a public funeral to him who had been starved." — **Seneca,** *De Tranquil. An.* **11**, 8. Such appeals to imagination and efforts at dramatic effect are a poor substitute for indignation at gross wrong. Pomponius may have been a literary rival of Seneca.

sister (or else his daughter) was prosecuted seventeen years later, as will appear in Nero's reign, for observance of Foreign Rites, that is, of Judaism. He himself had already, in the reign of Tiberius, after the rebellion of A. D. 31, been among those prosecuted by patricians for unbelief,[84] and after a confinement of seven years had been set at liberty by the truce which Caligula on his accession effected between contending parties.[85] During the latter's absence in Gaul, Pomponius must have been rearrested, and one [86] at least of his freedwomen was tortured ineffectually to make her testify against him. He himself would seem also to have been tortured until he was incapable of standing or moving. Caligula provided for the woman, took Pomponius to his own house and made an entertainment for him, at which the unfortunate man needed to be carried in. He reclined next below Caligula, whose foot, possibly, served him for a pillow. The warm-hearted poet kissed the foot on or near which his head rested. It was perhaps the only way in which, crippled as he was, he could testify his feelings towards his kindly relative. When Caligula, shortly afterwards, was murdered, his domestics must have fled, and Pomponius, unable to help himself, perished from want.

---

[84] See in the Appendix, Note G, foot-note 114. Caligula selected especially the prosecutions for unbelief as of senatorial origin.

[85] Caligula on his accession "set at liberty those in prison (of whom one was Quintus [?] Pomponius Secundus [Tac. *An.* **6**, 18], who for seven years after his consulate had been held in duress in his house) and put an end to the accusations for unbelief, from which especially he saw that the prisoners were suffering." — **Dio Cass. 59**, 6. The real motive for prosecuting these men was their connection with the popular party. Pomponius had shielded (Tac. *An.* **5**, 8) a friend of Sejanus and (Pliny, **13**, 26, 1) kept relics of the Gracchi.

[86] Dio Cassius (**59**, 26) applies to the woman the ambiguous term ἑταίρα, wife or mistress. Pomponius may have married an educated freedwoman whose position her tormentors sought to obscure. More probably she sustained neither relation to him, and they merely aimed by defaming her to diminish sympathy. The remarks by Josephus (*Antiq.* **19**, 1, 5) on the woman's antecedents are in a connection which bears unmistakable marks of patrician origin.

Patrician accounts are silent as to the sufferings of Pomponius, and charge the brutal usage of his freedwoman, not upon their own party, but upon Caligula, to whom, as to Tiberius, they attributed their own crimes.[87] In their eyes, the only remarkable thing in the whole transaction is a reward given a freedwoman for not testifying against her innocent patron, from which they doubtless argued that their own slaves and freedmen should not be permitted to testify against themselves when they had committed crime.[88] We now go back.

Caligula, who had been absent about a year, turned towards Rome. He told the messengers sent to him that he would bring his sword with him. He announced that he no longer wished to be regarded either as a member or primate of the Senate; that he was returning to the knights and the people.[89] The mass of citizens were in his favor, and therefore open conspiracy could not be maintained. A few connected with it were executed and a large number were banished. Whether those executed

---

[87] See Appendix, Note G, foot-note 114.

[88] "He discharged Pomponius, who had been accused of conspiracy against himself, [?] because he had been betrayed by a friend [?]; and to the man's companion he not only did no harm because of her having given no testimony when tortured, but even remunerated her with property." — **Dio Cass. 59**, 26. "He gave to a freedwoman eighty thousand sesterces for not discovering a crime committed by her patron, though she had been put to exquisite torture for that purpose."— **Sueton.** *Calig.* 16, Bohn's trans. Josephus (*Antiq.* **19**, 1, 5) calls the man Pompedius.

On patrician views of testimony by slave or freedman against master or patron, see pp. 76, 77; compare Ch. V. § 5; also Dio Cass. **60**, 15, 16.

[89] Caligula "announced also that he would return to those only who were wishing him, namely, the equestrian order and the people, for he would no longer be a member or presiding officer of the Senate." — **Suetonius**, *Calig.* 49. The senators had murdered (Sueton. *Calig.* 28) one of their own number in the Senate house. An ambiguous passage of **Seneca** ("Rulers do not [as under Caius] . . . feel alarm at the sight of every ship." — *Ad Polyb.* **32**, 4), raises suspicion that their fleet may, as in A. D. 37 (see p. 101) have murdered provincial rulers, or persons exiled by themselves and by their courts, a suspicion strengthened by the charge against Caligula of such murders (Sueton. *Calig.* 28; Philo, *Against Flac.* 21).

were condemned for conspiracy, or for crimes against the popular party, is a point on which we have no satisfactory evidence. The patricians, who held the law-making and controlled the judicial power, had certainly committed crimes enough against their opponents.

Caligula, as a protection to the mass of citizens, undertook to restore, or enlarge, their former electoral powers.[90] This was in the eyes of patricians an unpardonable offence, and insured his assassination.[91]

If an impulsive, though kind-hearted man, had, in confronting the Senate, been so provoked by its judicial murders and legalized crime as to condemn its members through impatience rather than because of careful investigation into the doings of each individual, his failing could be readily comprehended. Yet Seneca, who was disposed to point out his weak rather than his good points,[92] who was willing even to repeat partisan perversions of his conduct, nowhere names any one as UNJUSTLY put to death by him. The matters of dress, to which he excepts in connection with executions, imply that graver subjects of fault-finding were absent.[93]

---

[90] The Senate (see Ch. V. § X. 1) had, in A. D. 14, usurped the electoral rights of popular assemblies. Caligula "restored electoral assemblies to the citizens and multitude [*centuries and tribes?*]." — **Dio Cass. 59,** 9 ; compare **59,** 20. "He tried also, by recalling the custom of *Comitia*, to restore suffrage to the citizens." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 16.

[91] Chærea, who assassinated Caligula, had been active (see Tacitus, *An.* **1,** 32) in the attempted rebellion of A. D. 14, against Tiberius.

[92] Seneca moved in patrician society, and could not escape its influence. He was constitutionally the reverse of Caligula, who had moreover (see note 57) criticised his style, and in one instance (Dio Cass. **59,** 19) had come into collision with him in the Senate. Seneca may have felt that it cost him less self-respect to make political capital at expense of Caligula than of any one else. Compare note 131.

[93] "Caius Cæsar put to death by scourging, in one day, Sextus Papinius, WHOSE FATHER WAS OF CONSULAR RANK ; Betilienus Bassus, his quæstor, the son of his procurator, and other Roman knights and senators. . . . Afterwards, . . . while walking with matrons and senators in the promenade of his maternal gardens, he had some of them [the criminals] executed by candlelight. What urgency was there? What danger, either

If Caligula applied the laws, at this date, with undue severity, against any offenders, it was probably in requital against such as had brutally misapplied them towards individuals of the popular party.[94] He had become satisfied that Rome, ruled by the aristocracy, peopled largely by its slaves and retainers, and burdened with its legislation and with judicial decisions in its favor, was ill-adapted to the maintenance of justice. He thought of removing the government to Antium, but subsequently decided on taking it to Alexandria.[95]

If the question be asked why Caligula, who, as we may infer from the passage of Seneca already quoted, put but three senators to death, should in subsequent times have been more maligned than his successor, who executed thirty or thirty-five,[96] the answer is, that Claudius co-

---

private or public, did one night threaten? How little sacrifice would it have been to have awaited daylight, so that he should not whilst wearing slippers [!] put to death SENATORS OF THE ROMAN PEOPLE? . . . In this place it will be answered: 'A great thing if he apportioned to scourge and fire THREE senators as if they had been criminal slaves, the man who THOUGHT of killing the whole Senate, who WISHED [see note 72] that the Roman people had but one neck.' . . . What is so unheard of as nocturnal punishment?" — **Seneca**, *De Ira*, **3**, 18, 3–19, 2. Seneca does not intimate that scourge (compare Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 1190, col. 2) and fire were unusual punishments, except for patricians. Probably the ruling class had established or re-established them for certain offences. Dio Cassius (**59**, 7) mentions the wearing of slippers by people of rank as frequent at public games, and not infrequent on the judicial tribunal, though Tiberius had intermitted it. The Betillinus Cassius whom he mentions (**59**, 25) as executed in A. D. 40 is probably the above Bassus, who may, or may not, be the one mentioned in Ch. V. note 80.

[94] The attendance of Capito at his son's execution is said (Dio Cass. **59**, 25) to have been compulsory. This may be incorrect, or may have been in requital of similar action by him towards some member of the popular party. Seneca, who was certainly disposed to paint Caligula unfavorably, omits mention of the above (*De Ira*, **3**, 18, 3) from his account of the son's execution.

[95] Sueton. *Calig.* 49.

[96] Claudius put to death "thirty-five senators and more than three hundred Roman knights." — **Sueton.** *Claud.* 29. Another authority

operated with the patrician majority, murdering those whom it wished murdered. Caligula stood in its way, protecting alike the popular party, the monotheists, and the patrician minority.

3. THE ALLEGED STATUE FOR THE JEWISH TEMPLE.

A patrician Jew, connected unquestionably with the conspiracy of A. D. 37 against Caligula, charges that he purposed erecting his statue in the temple at Jerusalem. The charge comes from a suspicious source, and will not bear scrutiny.

Caligula began his reign with aversion or distaste for statues of himself.[97] Philo, who first mentions the charge against him of intending to erect his statue in the temple at Jerusalem, had abundant motive and opportunity for learning any order touching it. Yet he informs us that no plainly worded order to that effect had been issued.[98] We can safely assume, therefore, that the letters on the subject mentioned in Josephus[99] are spurious.

A statement surrounded by untruths is to be received with distrust, especially if an urgent motive for its fabrication be obvious. The distrust is not diminished by the method of Philo's narrative, who, instead of a plain statement, substitutes a scene.[100]

---

mentions "thirty senators killed, three hundred and fifteen Roman knights, and many (221) others." — **De Morte Claudii Ludus, 14,** 1, in Seneca, *Opp. Philos.* Vol. **2,** p. 299.

[97] **Dio Cassius** (**59**, 4) speaks of Caligula as "at first forbidding any one to set up images of himself." According to a Jew, "Caius managed public affairs with very great magnanimity during the first and second year of his reign, and behaved himself with such moderation that he gained the good-will both of the Romans themselves and of his other subjects." — **Josephus,** *Antiq.* **18, 7,** 2, Whiston's trans.

[98] "The letter respecting the erection of the statue was written not in plain terms." — **Philo,** *Embassy to Caius,* 31, Bohn's trans.; Paris edit. p. 703, lines 1, 2. If it was not written in plain terms, we can safely infer that it was not written by Caligula. Compare, in note 109, the order actually sent.

[99] Josephus, *Antiq.* **18,** 8, 2 and 8.

[100] "While we were anxiously considering, . . . a man arrived, with

Again: the story of Caligula's statue can neither be reconciled with the statements of its earliest narrator, nor with the known facts of history. Philo alleges that, whilst he and other ambassadors from Alexandria were awaiting audience from Caligula, the order, or at least the purpose of the latter to erect his statue, became known, and that some of the latter's correspondence with Petronius touching it took place at the subsequent harvest.[101] If we now examine into the date of these events, we learn from Philo that he and his companions came to Rome in midwinter,[102] and at a later date followed Caligula to

---

bloodshot eyes, and looking very much troubled, out of breath and palpitating, and leading us away to a little distance from the rest (for there were several persons near), he said, 'Have you heard the news?' And then, when he was about to tell us what it was, he stopped, because of the abundance of tears that rose up to choke his utterance. And, beginning again, he was a second and a third time stopped in the same manner. And we, seeing this, were much alarmed and agitated by suspense, and entreated him to tell us what the circumstance was on account of which he said that he had come; for he could not have come merely to weep before so many witnesses. 'If then,' said we, 'you have any real cause for tears, do not keep your grief to yourself; we have been long ago well accustomed to misfortune.'

"And he, with difficulty, sobbing aloud, and in a broken voice, spoke as follows: 'Our temple is destroyed! Caius has ordered a colossal statue of himself to be erected in the holy of holies, having his own name inscribed upon it with the title of Jupiter!' And while we were all struck dumb with astonishment and terror at what he told us, and stood still deprived of all motion (for we stood there mute and in despair, ready to fall to the ground with fear and sorrow, the very muscles of our bodies being deprived of all strength by the news which we had heard), others arrived bearing the same sad tale." — **Philo**, *Embassy to Caius*, 29, Bohn's trans.; *Opp.* Paris edit. pp. 700, 701. The statements or insinuations of Tacitus (*An.* **12**, 54; *Hist.* **5**, 9) will appear in our next two sections.

[101] **Petronius** "determined to write a letter to Caius. . . . It was just at the moment the very height of the wheat harvest and of all the other cereal crops." — **Philo**, *Embassy*, 33, Bohn's trans.; *Opp.* Paris edit. pp. 723, 724. Compare *Embassy*, 34; *Opp.* Paris edit. pp. 723, 724.

[102] Philo, *Embassy*, 29; *Opp.* Paris edit. p. 701, line 10.

Dicæarchia,[103] otherwise called Puteoli, where the latter's intention, or order, became known.

The embassy cannot have taken place in the winter of 40-41, for Caligula, who was murdered January 24, could not have corresponded with any one during the subsequent harvest. That winter's events also preclude the supposition that Caligula could have been absent at Dicæarchia to rusticate, or to superintend building.

It cannot have taken place in the winter of 39-40, for Caligula was then absent from Italy.

We must select, therefore, between the winters of 37-38 and 38-39. If any credit can be attached to Philo's own statements, we must assume the former of these two winters, since the embassy took place but a short time after Herod's arrival at Alexandria, in the autumn of 37.[104] This accords moreover with the condition of things in Alexandria, which was more likely to occasion an embassy in that, than in the subsequent winter. Caligula also was not unlikely after his illness to visit the seaside.

If we now assume even that the order was not given before the spring of 38, yet the two suppositions, that Caligula's death interrupted its execution, and that his

---

[103] Philo, *Embassy*, 29; *Opp.* Paris edit. p. 700, lines 34, 35.

[104] "This memorial [brought by the Embassy] was nearly an abridgment of a longer petition which we had sent to him A SHORT TIME BEFORE by the hand of King Agrippa; for he by chance was staying for a short time in the city [of Alexandria] while on his way into Syria to take possession of the kingdom which had been given him." — **Philo**, *Embassy*, 28, Bohn's trans.; *Opp.* Paris edit. p. 700, lines 11-13. In the tract, *Against Flaccus*, Philo's narrative, as already mentioned on page 100, implies that Herod arrived in September, or the early part of October, A. D. 37. Touching the alleged memorial forwarded by Herod, compare *Against Flaccus*, 12; *Opp.* Paris edit. pp. 672, 673. If Herod carried this letter, as the above implies, to Rome, then he cannot have continued his journey to Syria. He may, even if he returned as a prisoner, have hoped through Antonia, his mother's friend, to influence her grandson, the emperor. Philo's brother, her fiscal agent, may have sought her kindly intervention.

second letter reached Petronius after his assassination, become absurdities.

Further: The Jews during Caligula's reign multiplied at Rome to such a degree, that after his death the party in power assigned, though falsely, the fear of disturbance as a reason for their non-expulsion. The aristocracy were their enemies and this increase must therefore imply that Caligula had been their friend. The same is implied by the efforts of Philo, and of the writers whom Josephus copied,[105] to picture Herod as AN INTIMATE FRIEND OF CALIGULA whom the latter was loath to disoblige. It is yet further implied by the action of Herod, who in the year 41, when he became king, hung up in the temple a gold chain[106] which he professed to have received as a present from Caligula, and which he must have intended as evidence before the eyes of all beholders, that a friend of Caligula came to rule the Jews.

To appreciate the true import of his action, let us suppose a case scantly differing from common belief. Let us imagine that Herod had hung up in the temple a costly gift, alleging it to be from his near and intimate friend Beelzebub. Politically such a gift could, in a monotheistic community, have operated nothing but injury to its recipient, and its suspension in the temple would have shocked Jewish feeling. Yet if popular Jewish views of Caligula at the date of his death had been those which

---

[105] **Philo** puts into **Caligula's** mouth the utterance: "Agrippa [Herod], who is my most intimate and dearest friend and one bound to me by so many benefits." — *Embassy*, 35, Bohn's trans.; *Opp.* Paris edit. p. 724, line 27. According to **Josephus**, "King Agrippa, who now [at a date after the statue had been ordered] lived at Rome, was more and more in [the] favor of Caius." — *Antiq.* **18**, 8, 7, Whiston's trans. That writer makes **Caligula** remark to Herod: "It would be a base thing for me to be conquered by thy affection; I am, therefore, desirous to make thee amends for everything, in which I have been any way formerly deficient; for all that I have bestowed on thee, that may be called my gifts, is but little. Everything that may contribute to thy happiness shall be at thy service, and that cheerfully, and so far as my ability will reach." — *Ibid.*, Whiston's trans.

[106] Josephus, *Antiq.* **19**, 6, 1.

the aristocracy subsequently disseminated, a gift from Caligula and one from Beelzebub would in popular estimation have stood on a par.

The following may approximate to a correct narrative of what actually transpired. The effort at rebellion in Alexandria was accompanied by some slight or serious demonstration of the same kind on the not distant sea-coast west of Judæa. The governor of Syria was at once replaced by another, Petronius, a man who, according to both Philo and Josephus, had no unfriendliness to the Jews. Sufficient troops were at once ordered from Syria and the Euphrates to render any such effort hopeless.[107] Accompanying circumstances need a word of explanation. Effigies of friends were a common ornament in households. Public display or public destruction of such effigies implied political friendship, or hostility, to the person whom, or the cause which, they represented.[108] Thus, had Roman customs prevailed among us during our late rebellion, individuals who wished to indicate their political sympathies would, instead of hanging from their window a flag of the United States, or else of the Confederacy, have placed an effigy of Abraham Lincoln or of Jefferson Davis in front of their premises. The enemies of Caligula had been throwing down his effigies and those of his relatives, expressing thereby a wish to overthrow his government. Caligula wrote, that inside of Jerusalem the prevention of images, or non-Jewish sacrifices, should be permitted, but that if any one in the adjacent countries interfered with images of himself or family, or with sacrifices in their behalf, he should be called to account.[109] His views of images or sacrifices

---

[107] **Josephus**, *Antiq.* **18**, 8, 2; Philo, *Embassy*, 31; *Opp.* Paris edit. p. 703. Both these writers represent the movement of troops as precautionary against trouble in setting up the statue.

[108] See the attempted destruction of Piso's statues, Tacitus, *An.* **3**, 14. Livilla's are mentioned as destroyed, Tacitus, *An.* **6**, 2; those also of Sejanus, Dio Cass, **58**, 11; and of Vitellius, Tacitus, *Hist.* **3**, 85.

[109] **Caligula** "wrote: If in the adjoining countries, EXCEPT ONLY THE METROPOLIS, any person wishing to erect altars, or temples, or images,

cannot be inferred from this order. The army, when danger was over, returned to its former quarters.[110]

After Caligula's death, the Jewish aristocracy, either through malignity or to mitigate the odium under which they labored as associates of his murderers, undertook to defame him. In this they were aided by the following circumstances. The Alexandrine populace had seen the Jewish aristocracy there prompting the destruction of Caligula's images at a moment when he was dangerously ill, and when the popular party in every land was anxiously hoping and petitioning for his recovery. In their indignation they had carried one of his images triumphantly into a synagogue, perhaps into one where his chief enemies gathered.[111] Again: Caligula's pleasantries with

---

or statues, are hindered from sacrificing [to the gods] in behalf of myself or relatives, punish at once those who hinder them, or else bring them before you." — **Philo**, *Embassy*, 42, *Opp.*, Paris edit. p. 730, lines 12 – 15. That heathens should sacrifice for the welfare of Caligula and his family implies no more desire on their part to deify him than on the part of Jews, who sacrificed for the same object. Yet Philo represents himself, however untruthfully, as saying to Caligula: "We did sacrifice, and we offered up entire hecatombs, the blood of which we poured in a libation upon the altar, and the flesh we did not carry to our homes to make a feast and banquet upon it, as it is the custom of some people to do, but we committed the victims entire to the sacred flame as a burnt offering; and we have done this three times already, and not once only: on the first occasion when you succeeded to the empire, and the second time when you recovered from that terrible disease with which all the habitable world was [through sympathy] afflicted at the same time, and the third time we sacrificed in hope of your victory over the Germans." — **Philo**, *Embassy*, 45, Bohn's trans.; *Opp.*, Paris edit. p. 732, lines 20 – 25. The movement into Germany was of much later date than this Embassy, and cannot have been mentioned by Philo in any speech to Caligula. Any sacrifice for recovery of the latter can scarcely have been offered by Jews in rebellion against him.

[110] Petronius "took the army out of Ptolemais and returned to Antioch." — **Josephus**, *Wars*, **2**, 10, 5, Whiston's trans. This is represented as occurring in the spring, though whether in that of 38, or of some later year, is open to surmise.

[111] The populace "set up in every [?] one of them [the synagogues]

regard to Castor and Pollux, or Jupiter, admitted, at a distance, of serious misrepresentation. Further: in the latter part of Caligula's reign — probably when he was about to return from Gaul — persons who had compromised themselves must have undertaken, by ridiculous homage of his statues, to divert indignation from their misdeeds.[112] There is no reason to suppose that he thanked them for it, or that he was in the least degree imposed upon by it.

In course of time the Jewish and Roman aristocracies obtained partial credence for their falsehoods concerning Caligula. The former body must have overdone its intended work by creating a belief that the head of the

---

images of Caius; and in the greatest and most conspicuous and most celebrated of them they erected a brazen statue of him borne on a four-horse chariot." — **Philo**, *Embassy.* 20, Bohn's trans.; *Opp.* Paris edit. p. 695. Jews of the popular party shared doubtless the indignation against their rulers, and may in some cases have cared but little for the method of its manifestation. The aristocratic synagogues had been ornamented by their owners (Philo, *Ibid.*) with shields, crowns, pillars, and inscriptions in honor of the emperor, that is, probably, of Augustus.

[112] "He (?) also instituted a temple and priests, with choicest victims, in honor of his own divinity. In his temple stood a statue of gold, the exact image of himself, which was daily dressed in garments corresponding with those he wore himself. The most opulent persons in the city offered themselves as candidates for the honor of being his priests, and purchased it successively at an immense price. The victims were flamingos, peacocks, bustards, guinea-fowls, turkey and pheasant hens, each sacrificed on their respective days." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 22, Bohn's trans.

Caligula, as already stated in note 97, had, during the first half, at least, of his reign, a repugnance to images, and during most of its latter half was absent in Gaul. The foregoing obsequiousness was, no doubt, as in the case of Tiberius and Sejanus (see Appendix, Note G, foot-note 48), unauthorized by the person towards whom it was shown. To Caligula, if in Gaul, it may even have been unknown. If a temple and priests were instituted to him, it must have been done by the frightened Senate, who had been torturing his relatives and friends. It had in A. D. 39, after he rebuked it for its falsehoods concerning Tiberius, resorted to the same childish folly of voting sacrifices to his clemency (Dio Cass. **59**, 16), though he had left the city before the vote was passed.

Roman Empire was naturally God's chief opponent. This belief is clearly discernible eleven or twelve years after Caligula's death, when Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome ; it gained additional strength from the war which commenced under Nero, and it eventuated in a conception called Antichrist, which has not yet died out.

§ IV. *Claudius. A Reign of Patricianism and Heathenism.*

After the assassination of Caligula (January 24, A. D. 41) a brief struggle placed the patricians in power, with Claudius as emperor. Herod, their agent in the Alexandrine rebellion, was at once rewarded with a large kingdom. Lysimachus, brother of Philo, and head as it would seem of patrician Judaism at Alexandria, was released from imprisonment,[113] and the Jewish commonalty in that city, for it must have been they who rebelled against the new arrangement, were crushed.[114]

At Rome the expulsion of Jews must have been discussed but deferred, not for the reason assigned by Dio Cassius, but because of the political embarrassment which it would have caused to Herod and to the Jewish aristocracy, allies whom patricianism needed to strengthen. For the same reason prosecutions for unbelief must have been intermitted.[115] A decree was, however, issued for restricting Judaism and Gentile monotheism at Rome, and therewith perhaps for abolishing clubs of the popular party.[116]

---

[113] Josephus, *Antiq.* **19**, 5, 1.

[114] Josephus, *Antiq.* **19**, 5, 2. Tacitus would like us to believe (*An.* **12**, 54) that a rebellion of the same date in Judæa was against Caligula, and that it quieted down on the accession of Claudius.

[115] Claudius "in like manner put an end, not in his edicts alone, but practically, to prosecution for unbelief." — **Dio Cassius, 60**, 3.

[116] "He did not indeed expel the Jews, who had multiplied again so that, because of their number, they could with difficulty be kept out of the city unless at the cost of a disturbance; but he forbade the assembling of such as lived according to their law.

"He also dissolved the [heathen? or monotheist?] associations (ἑταιρεί-

The faction in power commenced an era of terrorism towards its antagonists of every grade. The murder of slaves under circumstances of refined cruelty has been already narrated.[117] Citizens of all classes were put to torture.[118] Body guards were murdered.[119] Executions must have been constantly going on.[120] Senators distasteful to the majority were driven out. Equestrians of whose influence the Senate felt a need were enrolled, and the fact claims much reflection that some of these pre-

---

as) which had been reintroduced by Caius [Caligula], and seeing that it was useless to forbid the multitude any course of action unless their daily course of life were at the same time corrected, he closed the taverns and forbade the sale of cooked meat or warm water, and punished some who disobeyed this enactment." — **Dio Cassius, 60,** 6. The last paragraph might be understood as aimed simply against the popular party, but a previous prosecution of some one for unbelief because he had sold warm water (Dio Cassius, **59,** 11) suggests that the article may have been specially used in some way by adherents of Judaism. If the associations were monotheistic, the inference would become probable that they had been suppressed in A. D. 19 and reintroduced in A. D. 37, as part of the compromise which Caligula effected at his accession.

It may have been at this same date that Claudius "totally abolished [at Rome ?] the Druid religion, which among *Gallos* inhabitants of Gaul was dreadfully cruel, and which had by Augustus been interdicted only to citizens." — **Sueton.** *Claud.* 25. If Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* **30,** 4, 1) be correct that the same had been done under Tiberius, its date must have been under A. D. 19 or 31, during one of the senatorial rebellions against that emperor. Then, or under Claudius, it merely meant that the Senate had no wish to tolerate what it did not control. Compare Appendix, Note A, foot-note 7.

[117] See pp. 76, 77, with which compare note 72 of this chapter.

[118] "They used slaves and freedmen as witnesses against their masters. They put to the torture these [masters] and others, some even the highest born, not merely foreigners but citizens; not merely plebeians but equestrians and senators." — **Dio Cass. 60,** 15. The party which perpetrated this was the one which had always been vociferous against using the testimony of slaves against their masters or of freedmen against their patrons.

[119] Josephus, *Antiq.* **19,** 5, 1; quoted in Ch. V. note 109.

[120] See note 96.

ferred suicide to acceptance of a seat in such a body.[121] Their repugnance may have been due to moral sense or political feeling or to both combined. Reluctant or lukewarm senators were kept within reach of coercion from their colleagues by a law that no senator should go more than seven miles from Rome without imperial permission.[122]

Political preferences were at that date manifested by each one setting up, probably before his dwelling, the picture or statue or statuette of his political leader. To the ruling class any such admiration of popular leaders would be intolerable. The removal and prohibition of images[123] applied doubtless to those of their opponents, not to those of their favorites. It is significant of unabated popular affection for Caligula that his images had to be removed stealthily by night.[124]

Reaction would by many of its supporters have been deemed incomplete unless some outward attention to heathen religious rites were enforced. In determining

---

[121] Claudius "rebuked so severely those (equestrians) who disobeyed [a summons to convene with the Senate] that some committed suicide." — **Dio Cass. 60,** 11. "From those who declined the senatorial dignity he took away the equestrian." — **Sueton.** *Claud.* 24, Bohn's trans. Compare Ch. VII. note 61, and the utterance of Caligula in note 89 of the present chapter. In A. D. 47 a Gaul went to Carthage (Dio Cass. **60,** 29) that he might avoid being made senator.

[122] Suidas, art. *Klaudios.* Compare an exception to the law made in A. D. 49, *ob egregiam in Patres reverentiam,* "because of conspicuous deference to the Senate." — **Tac.** *An.* **12,** 23. Conscious tyranny begets suspicion. The custom was initiated of searching every one, man or woman (Dio Cass. **60,** 3), who approached the emperor, nor was it intermitted until the accession of Vespasian.

[123] "Since the city was filled with a multitude of images, — for it was lawful, without restraint to all who wished, to publicly set them up in delineations, or in brass or stone, — [Claudius] removed most of them elsewhere, and for the future forbade any private person, without permission OF THE SENATE, to do such a thing, unless when building or repairing some structure." — **Dio Cass. 60,** 25.

[124] Claudius "secretly by night put out of sight all his [Caligula's] images." — **Dio Cass. 60,** 4.

how these resuscitated religious observances were received by Romans, we can facilitate our work by classifying them. Those which ministered to eating, drinking, and idleness admitted temporary revival without difficulty. The aristocracy, as the moneyed class, were likely to share the suffering from popular excess in this direction and were soon glad to co-operate in curbing it.[125] But observances which ministered to no human appetite or passion needed repeated governmental effort to prevent their neglect or extinction.[126] Seneca may have deferred pub-

[125] In A. D. 43, Claudius "put an end to many of the sacrifices and festivals, for the largest portion of the year was wasted on them, and the injury thereby to the public was not small. He, therefore, abrogated those, and contracted [the duration of] as many others as possible." — **Dio Cass. 60, 17.**

[126] Tacitus tells us, under A. D. 47, Claudius "called the attention of the Senate to the college of soothsayers, that the oldest [religious] science of Italy might not die out through neglect. [He said that] 'often during adverse circumstances of the republic [persons] had been sent for, by whose direction ceremonies had been re-established and thereafter more correctly conducted; [that] the nobility, *primores*, of Etruria had of their own accord, or under PROMPTING FROM THE ROMAN FATHERS, retained the knowledge and taught it to their slaves, *in familias propagasse*, which was now more negligently done because of public APATHY TOWARDS GOOD ARTS, and because FOREIGN SUPERSTITIONS ARE GAINING STRENGTH. All things indeed are at present [he said] prosperous, but thanks should be given to the benignity of the gods.'

"That the sacred rites should not, through uncertainty touching [the manner of] their observance, be obliterated by [existing] prosperity, it was thereupon enacted by the Senate that the chief priests should examine what observances of the soothsayers ought to be retained and put upon a better footing." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **11**, 15.

Several things in the foregoing extract claim attention. It is a confession that the patricians, though constantly prosecuting others for unbelief, were utterly ignorant of the so-called religion which they pretended to uphold. The statement that only in public calamity had it been customary to give much attention to religious rites confirms, if confirmation were needed, the view that these were not supposed to have a bearing on morality. If the method of conducting these had to be ascertained by inquiry from the aristocracy of Etruria, there must have been utter inattention to the subject at Rome. And if this Etrurian

lishing his uncomplimentary description of these observances until after the death of Claudius, when it could be more safely done.[127]

The order of nature did not always accommodate itself to the wants of reactionaries, and in one instance they were placed by it in a somewhat ridiculous position.

---

aristocracy needed prompting from the Roman Senate to do that which the Senate itself utterly neglected, we can reasonably infer that neither party had much affection for their task. Teaching slaves would scarcely impart to them an interest which the teachers did not feel, or a knowledge of which they were destitute. It is more than possible that, if a wealthy Etrurian sent such a learned slave to teach the Roman officials their duty, one half of his instructions would be the mere inventions of himself or his master. The sacrifice of a sow in treaty-making (Sueton. *Claud.* 25) could be confidently adopted as anti-Jewish.

The mention of "superstitions" in the plural was an effort at self-deception. Christianity, even five years later than this, was regarded at Rome as a part of Judaism; and this being assumed, there was no foreign religion save Judaism and no native one either, which was engaged in public teaching. No religion save monotheism was gaining ground.

[127] "The gods themselves, if they desire such things, ought not to receive worship from any race of men. . . . Madness [however] once a year [as in some Egyptian rites previously mentioned] is bearable. Go to the Capitol. You will be ashamed of the office — assumed by empty [headed] excitement — of publicly displaying its senselessness. One places candles [for *numina* read *lumina*] before a god; another announces the hour of day to Jupiter; another is lictor; another is anointer, who with meaningless motion of his arms imitates an anointer. There are feminine hair-dressers for Juno and Minerva, who standing far, not merely from the images, but from the temple, move their fingers as if ornamenting [a head]. Some women hold a looking-glass, . . . some sit in the Capitol who think that Jupiter is in love with them, nor are they [on that account] afraid of Juno: . . . all which things a wise man *servabit* will uphold (!) as LEGAL COMMANDS, but not as acceptable to the gods." — **Seneca,** quoted by **Augustine,** *De Civitate Dei,* **6,** 10, 11.

Another writer says of the emperor: "Upon the sight of any ominous bird in the city or Capitol, he issued an order for a supplication, the words of which . . . he recited in the presence of the people, who repeated them after him; all workmen and slaves being first ordered to withdraw." — **Suetonius,** *Claud.* 22, Bohn's trans. Did the deities share patrician contempt for workmen and slaves?

Reverence for omens was part of the reactionary creed, but in A. D. 45 an eclipse of the sun was about to happen, unfortunately for them, on the emperor's birthday. This compelled a public explanation that such events, instead of being ominous, were merely due to the regular motion of the moon.[128]

In A. D. 49 augury, after an extinction of twenty-five years, was for a time restored.[129] In the same year Seneca was recalled. He had been banished to Corsica on the accession of Claudius, because, doubtless, of his lukewarm patricianism, though a different reason was assigned. His recall has been attributed to Agrippina, the ambitious sister of Caligula, who in this year married her uncle, the emperor. A surmise deserves consideration, whether it may not have been due to public indignation at wholesale murder, misrule, and the effort to force absurdities on the community as entitled to religious respect. The party in power may have conceded to popular feeling the appointment of Seneca and Burrhus as instructors of their future prince,[130] that they might thus retain their authority under Claudius with less likelihood of overthrow.

Whether Seneca made unworthy concessions is also a point for consideration.[131] Some of his utterances touch-

---

[128] Dio Cass. **60**, 26. [129] Tacitus, *An.* **12**, 23.

[130] "Agrippina . . . obtained for Annæus Seneca a reversal of his exile, and with it the pretorship; favors which she supposed would prove ACCEPTABLE TO THE PUBLIC. . . . She also wished that the youthful mind of her son Domitius [Nero] should be trained up to manhood under such a preceptor." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **12**, 8, Bohn's trans. Compare *An.* **13**, 2–4, where Seneca and Burrhus are mentioned as *rectores*, guardians, or directors of the emperor's youth.

[131] "It is a great solace of my miseries to notice his [the emperor's] world-wide mercy. . . . I do not fear lest it should overlook me alone. He, however, knows best the time when to relieve each. I will make every effort that he may not blush on extending it to me." — **Seneca**, *Ad Polyb. Consolat.* **22**, 3. "The object of the address to Polybius was to have his sentence of exile recalled, even at the cost of his character." — **Smith**, *Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **3**, p. 778, col. 2, art. *Seneca.* On this treatise a French writer of the last century remarks: "At first [when published]

ing persons or things politically distasteful to patricians indicate the influences which surrounded him.[132]

§ v. *A. D.* 52 – 54. *Expulsion of the Jews. Claudius as Belial.*

The aristocracy, on the accession of Claudius, had avoided expelling the Jews, lest they should embarrass the position of their co-conspirator, Herod. He was now dead, and the events of A. D. 52 afforded the desired pretext for such expulsion.

Tacitus, in concluding his narrative of events AT ROME for the year 51, mentions REPEATED earthquakes, and connects their mention with that of a failure of crops and a consequent scarcity of provisions,[133] which was regarded

---

every one was scandalized. Next a wish was expressed that the treatise might not be Seneca's. Subsequently a doubt was expressed whether it were his. Only one step remained, namely, to allege that it was not his." — **Diderot**, quoted in Le Maire's edition of **Seneca**, *Opp. Philos.*, Vol. **2**, p. 238. Diderot strives to prove that Seneca did not write the work, but his arguments are unsatisfactory. It is indeed inconsistent with the *Ludus in Mortem Claudii*, but the latter work is not Seneca's. It is inconsistent with truth and self-respect. Seneca must have sacrificed somewhat of both. It is written by an exile under Claudius ; is addressed to one whom we know that Seneca addressed ; is written in Seneca's style, and its criticism on Caligula (c. 36) resembles the tone of Seneca elsewhere. His political friends, anxious for his return and co-operation, may have urged him to make concessions.

[132] "Since, however, the [Sabbath] usage of that most villanous race, *sceleratissimæ gentis*, has so gained strength that it pervades all lands, the conquered have given laws to the conquerors." — **Seneca**, quoted by **Augustine**, *De Civitate Dei*, **6**, 11. "Let us prohibit any one from lighting candles on Sabbaths." — **Seneca**, *Epist.* **95**, 47.

[133] "Many prodigies happened in that year. Birds of evil omen perched on the Capitol: houses were thrown down by repeated earthquakes, and, through fear of more extended ruin, every infirm person was trampled down by the frightened multitude. Deficiency of provisions, and consequent famine, WERE DEEMED AN OMEN, *prodigium*. Nor were complaints made only in secret ; but while Claudius was deciding legal cases [the grumblers] pressed around him with tumultuous clamor, and after having driven him to the extremity of the Forum, were violently pushing against him, until,

as ominous, though he does not tell us what it was supposed to portend. The scarcity prevailed in the winter, apparently, of 51 – 52. Possibly that historian may — to avoid repetition, or for some other motive — have concluded in 51 what extended into 52, anticipating somewhat, as he has elsewhere done.[134] I shall assume that these earthquakes — whether they did or did not extend into the latter year — occurred in the winter of 51 – 52, since that agrees best with such other data as we can reliably connect therewith.[135] If the reader deems the preceding summer, or winter, more probable, he must then place the subsequent train of events so much earlier.

The earthquakes and widespread famine must have caused, or brought to its culmination, a Messianic excitement; and Claudius, according to **Suetonius**, "expelled from Rome the Jews, who, under the impulse of Christianity, were keeping up a constant disturbance."[136] The

---

in a circle of soldiers, he broke through the angry [surrounders]. It is certain that not more than fifteen days' food remained for the city. By great benignity of the gods and mildness (*modestia*) of the winter, the extremity was done away with." — **Tacitus**, *Annals*, **12**, 43.

[134] Tacitus (*Annals*, **15**, 22) puts into the year A. D. 62 an earthquake, which Seneca (*Nat. Quæst.* **6**, 1, 2), writing within two years, or perhaps within one, after its occurrence, places on the 5th of February, A. D. 63.

[135] The death of Philip, connected, as we shall soon see, with the excitement consequent on these earthquakes, is placed by distinct evidence in A. D. 52 (Claudii, 12). Paul, after staying eighteen months at Corinth (Acts **18**, 11), sailed thence to Syria (Acts, **18**, 18), which he would hardly have attempted in early winter. The feast which he wished to attend (Acts **18**, 21) was probably a passover, and if so his departure from Corinth must have been in February or March; his arrival there eighteen months earlier must have been in August or September, and his arrival in Macedonia must have been in the early part of that year or the close of the preceding.

[136] "*Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes, Roma expulit.*" — **Sueton.** *Claudius*, 25. The omission by Tacitus to mention this expulsion is noteworthy. The use of the word "Christ" for "Christianity" is common enough, as in Paul's letter to the Philippians, **1**, 15. The spelling of Chrestus, instead of Christus, accords with a common pronunciation of the word among the heathens. **Tertullian**, in his *Apology*, 3,

heathens could have no motive for exculpating Jews at the expense of Christians. Hence the allegation, that

---

remarks that the word "Christian as regards its meaning is derived from anointing, and even when it is wrongly pronounced by you 'CHRESTIAN,' — for your acquaintance with the name is not thorough, — it would still be composed from [a word which means] suavity or benignity." **Lactantius** moreover, in his *Divine Institutes*, Book **4**, ch. 7, says "that the meaning of this name [Christum] needs to be explained on account of an error of ignorant men who are accustomed to utter it with the change of one letter, 'CHRESTUM.'"

Owing to the fact that in Greek the word CHRIST or CHRISTIAN would, by the change of a single letter, mean GOOD, we find several passages in Christian writers which seem to play on the similarity of these words. Thus in **Clement of Alexandria** we read, *Strom.* **2**, 18; *Opp.* **1**, p. 438: "Believers on Christ are, and are called, GOOD, χρηστοί. The change of one letter would make it read are, and are called, Christians." The same writer in his *Pædag.* **1**, 44; *Opp.* **1**, p. 124, quoting the passage **1 Peter 2**, 3: "If ye have tasted that the Lord is good," makes it by altering one letter read, "If ye have tasted that Christ is the Lord," ὅτι Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος. And again in *Strom.* **5**, 67; *Opp.* **2**, p. 685, he quotes from **Psalm 34**, 8 (Septuagint, **33**, 9) the same sentiment with the same alteration: "Taste and see that Christ is the Lord." Again, *Protrept.* § 123; *Opp* **1**, p. 95, he says: "Good χρηστός is the whole life of men who have known Christ, χριστόν"; and with a slight additional alteration in the *Protrept.* § 87; *Opp.* **1**, p. 72, he says: "Taste and see that Christ is divine." In this latter instance he substitutes for the word Κύριος, Lord, the word Θεός, God, which means also divine. **Justin Martyr**, in his *Apology*, **1**, 4, tells the Emperor, "so far as concerns the name alleged against us, we are χρηστότατοι, VERY GOOD." And again, *Apology*, **1**, 4, "We are accused of being χριστιανοί, Christians, but it is unjust to hate τὸ δὲ χρηστόν, what is GOOD." **Theophilus** probably intended the same play on the ordinary pronunciation of this word when he says **1**, 1 (*Justin. Opp.* p. 338), "I confess that I am a Christian . . . who hopes to be εὔχρηστος serviceable to (or a good Christian before) God." There is, moreover, still extant a dialogue entitled **Philopatris**, written by some heathen in the fourth century, and erroneously ascribed to the **Lucian**, who lived two centuries earlier. In this dialogue Christianity is defended by **Triephon** in such a manner as might be expected from a heathen who wished to ridicule it. **Critias** asks him, "Are the affairs of the Scythians also registered in heaven?" **Triephon** answers, "All. For Christ [χρηστός] has been among the Gentiles." I take the passage from **Lardner's** Works, Vol. **7**, p. 287.

Christianity was to blame for the disturbance, must have originated with conservative Jews.[137] The same allegation, apparently, is attributed to Jews in a passage of Acts (**17**, 6, 7) hereafter to be considered, and we shall have occasion to notice advice of Paul (Rom. **13**, 1 – 7) to Christians at Rome, which seems prompted by this charge, and intended to guard against their giving just ground for its repetition. A larger proportion of Christian than of non-Christian Jews were likely to be affected by any Messianic excitement; since the worldly-minded would be slow to join the new religion. This probably prompted the accusation.

By turning to the history of Paul, we find that, a few months after arriving in Macedonia, he met some of the expelled Jews who had lately arrived in Greece,[138] so that we can safely consider his journey through these two countries as of about the same date with the troubles at Rome. Let us examine it.

At Philippi, a half-crazy girl, prompted doubtless by her employers, followed Paul and his co-laborers day after day through the streets, shouting: "These men are slaves [139] of the HIGHEST god, who announce to US the way

---

[137] It is a not uncommon weakness, that men endeavor, by denouncing others, to divert public reproaches from themselves. In the second century the severest diatribes against the Jews came from that section of Christians, namely, the semi-Jewish, which had embodied most largely from Jewish theology into its own, and which on that account was most exposed to, and most sensitive about, being confounded with Jews. In our own day and country, the motion of censure on an outspoken antislavery member of Congress in 1842 came from a member of that political party which had most, not from that which had least, antislavery in its own ranks.

[138] "Paul having left Athens came to Corinth, and finding there a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, who had lately come from Italy, as also his wife Priscilla, — because Claudius had ordered all Jews to leave Rome, — he joined them, and, because his trade was the same, remained with them and worked, for they were tent-makers." — **Acts 18**, 1 – 3.

[139] "Bondsmen of God" was among Jews a technical term for themselves. See in Appendix, Note B, I. No. 12. When used in ridicule by a heathen, we must divest it of reverential associations.

to be safe."[140] The utterance contained more than one sarcasm. Much of Jewish teaching assumed that safety could only be attained by accepting Judaism. At the present moment, expulsion was decreed, or threatened, expressly because of holding it. The Jews spoke of their God as the HIGHEST, yet he had not, in heathen opinion, availed to protect them against worshippers of inferior deities. (Compare on p. 149 a similar sarcasm quoted from Cicero, *pro Flacco*, 28.) Paul, after bearing the annoyance for several days, cured the girl, and was immediately, with Silas, brought by her employers before the magistrates, not on the charge of being a Christian, but on a complaint that "these men, being Jews, are utterly disturbing our city, and teach CUSTOMS which it is not permissible for us Romans to receive or observe."[141] The bringing of such a charge is tolerable evidence of a political current setting against the Jews. The obsequiousness of the magistrates corroborates the same. With their own hands they pulled the clothes from Paul and Silas, ordered them a beating, and learned next morning, to their dismay, that their over-zeal had betrayed them into a serious offence against Roman law.[142]

The earthquake which shattered the foundation of the prison agrees in violence with the series mentioned by Tacitus. The question of the jailer, "What must I do to be saved?"[143] renders probable that the attention of men had, during the excitement, been publicly attracted to Jewish phraseology.

---

[140] **Acts 16**, 17. The girl was alleged to be possessed by a spirit of Apollo, *πύθωνος*, an idea suggested, perhaps, by the temporary anti-Jewish current, and the desire to revive heathen claims to inspiration.

[141] **Acts 16**, 21. The law prohibiting observance of "Foreign Rites" was perhaps applicable, outside of Rome, only against Romans, not against other nationalities. Neither can it, outside of Rome, have applied to Jews, even if they were Roman citizens.

[142] "Beating us . . . uncondemned Roman citizens, they imprisoned us." — **Acts 16**, 37. The accusation of teaching Jewish CUSTOMS was, it may be remarked, inapplicable to Paul, and it is doubtful whether any law existed aimed directly against what he was doing.

[143] **Acts 16**, 30.

At Thessalonica, Paul's next scene of labor, the Jewish small traders, or, more literally, "the Jews of the market place class . . . dragged Jason [Paul's host] and certain brethren before the city rulers, shouting that 'these [Christians] who have turned the world upside down [alluding to the uproar at Rome] are here too, whom Jason has received; and ALL of them violate Cæsar's decrees, alleging that there is another king, one Jesus.'"[144] The charge is brought against Christians as a class. It corroborates the inference from Suetonius, that the Jews at Rome threw the blame of their commotion on the Christians. It implies also that the commotion there was ALREADY known at Thessalonica; and hence it is probable that the earthquake at Philippi, just mentioned, was among the last of the series.

At Berœa, Paul's next stopping-place, he met ready listeners. Luke's language leaves it uncertain whether he attributes this to their better disposition, or to a social standing which presented less temptation to time-serving.[145]

At Athens a remark is made, "This man seems to be a proclaimer of FOREIGN DIVINITIES,"[146] and Paul is told, "You bring things to our hearing, *ξενίζοντα*, AKIN TO FOREIGN,"[147] that is, "which resemble Judaism." The hint, or threat, caused **Paul** to introduce his subject cautiously. "I found an altar to 'AN UNKNOWN GOD.' Whom, there-

[144] **Acts 17**, 5–7. Paul's converts at Thessalonica were chiefly Gentiles (1 Thess. **1**, 9), many of whom had previously (Acts **17**, 4) been monotheists. Their heathen neighbors (1 Thess. **2**, 14) persecuted them with hearty political zeal.

[145] **Acts 17**, 11. *Εὐγενής* may mean either "well born" or "noble minded." The ambiguity of the original could be retained by translating, "These [Jews] were a better class than those at Thessalonica." The reader can compare Luke **19**, 12; 1 Cor. **1**, 26, the only other instances in the New Testament where the word is used.

[146] **Acts 17**, 18. The reason assigned for their remark is that Paul made the glad announcement of Jesus [as the Messiah] and of the resurrection. A Messiah and a resurrection were recognized as "foreign," that is, Jewish doctrines.

[147] **Acts 17**, 20.

fore you practically recognize[148] without knowing him, him I will proclaim to you." In other words, I will not teach a "foreign deity," but one to whom you have already shown marks of recognition.

At Corinth, Paul, after teaching in the synagogue for some time, separated from the Jewish organization and taught in the school of a certain Tyrannus. This movement is readily explained by the existing excitement which rendered it temporarily more dangerous for heathens to observe the Sabbath, or other Jewish customs, and which perhaps prompted the Jews to greater zeal in the enforcement of such observances.

A consequence of this action on Paul's part was that some Jews brought him before Gallio,[149] the proconsul, on the charge that "this man, contrary to the [Roman] law, persuades men to recognize God."[150] Gallio refused attention to any such charge. The Gentile bystanders probably thought that the charge, WHEN IT CAME FROM A JEW, could not well be exceeded in meanness, since the Jews themselves were the most persistent propagators of this very recognition.[151] They took Sosthenes, and, without any interference from Gallio, gave him a beating. The proconsul thought probably that he richly deserved it.

Tacitus, under A. D. 52, mentions, though in a circuitous manner, a fear entertained by the Jews lest Claudius

---

[148] **Acts 17**, 23. See Appendix, Note B, I. No. 6.

[149] Gallio was a brother of Seneca who has left us (*Nat. Quæst.* Introduct. to Book **4**) a high encomium on his character.

[150] **Acts 18**, 13.

[151] The complaint against Paul has been constantly misunderstood as a charge that he taught something at variance with the Mosaic law; not a likely charge before a heathen judge. Owing to this misapprehension a few manuscripts and versions have attributed the beating to Jews, and others omit the word "Greeks," without substituting another in its place. Let the reader imagine that during the antislavery discussion in this country any active partisan of that movement had accused a rival leader of it, before a South Carolina court, of being an abolitionist. Men would have felt concerning it as the Gentiles felt touching the accusation against Paul.

should attempt to put his statue in the temple at Jerusalem.[152] There are two ways of accounting for this fear. The Jewish aristocracy, in their effort at self-exculpation after the death of Caligula, may have created an impression among their countrymen that an emperor of Rome would naturally attempt to rival God. More probably, however, the Roman aristocracy undertook this insult to Judaism (cp. *Indirect Testimony*, III. 8) and were foiled, with aid perhaps of Jewish gold, by the younger Herod Agrippa, long in the family of Claudius.

If we now turn to Paul's epistles, we shall find two at least — those to the Thessalonians — which were written at this period.[153] Both bear marks of a Messianic expectation more intense than can be found in his other writings.[154] This expectation is, moreover, in the second

---

[152] Tacitus omits or suppresses all mention of Jewish expulsion by Claudius. He mentions a local trouble between two Roman governors, one of Judæa and Samaria, the other of Galilee, giving only individual reasons for it, but adding: "Fear remained [since Caligula's time] lest any one of THE EMPERORS should give the same commands." — **Tac.** *An.* **12**, 54. Only Claudius had reigned since, whom alone Tacitus must have had in mind, though he does not mention him. The commands are unexplained in the context; but in another work the same writer says that the Jews "being commanded by Caius Cæsar (Caligula) to place his effigy in [their] temple, took up arms in preference, which commotion the death of Cæsar terminated." — **Tacitus,** *Hist.* **5**, 9.

[153] The epistles to the Thessalonians were obviously written from Athens, or Corinth, shortly after Paul had left Thessalonica; see 1 Thess. **3**, 1, 2, 5, 6, and 2 Thess. **2**, 2, which last seems to imply that the second letter was written partly to remove misapprehension of the first, and, therefore, while the former was fresh in the minds of the Thessalonians.

[154] "We living who remain until the Lord's coming shall not precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord himself — with summons given by an archangel's blast upon the trumpet of God — shall descend from heaven and the Christian dead shall rise first. Then we living who remain shall be caught up with them, enveloped by clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and thus we shall ever be with him. . . . But ye brethren are not in darkness, that that day come upon you like a thief." — **1 Thess. 4**, 15–17; **5**, 4. **Paul's** statement (**4**, 15), that this was "in

letter, connected by Paul with the Impersonation of Heathenism — the Heathen emperor — who was to precede the Messiah's coming.[155] If we remember that Paul

---

accordance with the Lord's teaching," refers, probably, to what has been recorded in Matt. **24**, 30, 31. The event recorded in Acts **1**, 9, may have caused the belief that Christians were to be enveloped during their ascension by a cloud. In a preceding verse Paul says of the condemned, "The [day of] anger is finally upon them." — **1 Thess. 2**, 16.

155 "We beseech you, brethren, by the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering to him, that you be not readily shaken out of your understanding nor put into trepidation, neither by [supposed impulse of the] spirit [in any of you], nor yet by teaching or epistle, because of its coming from us, as if the day of the Lord were close upon you. Let no one mislead you in any wise, for [it will not occur] unless there first have taken place THE FALLING AWAY [from monotheism?] and unless the Sinful Man, the Son of Destruction, shall have appeared opposing himself to, and raising himself above, everything divine or hallowed [literally, 'called God or shrine'] so as to seat himself in the temple of God showing himself for God."

"Do you not remember that while I was yet with you I said these things to you, and now you know what hinders that he should be manifested in his own time, for the secret of LAW-LESSNESS [the as yet undeveloped manifestation of heathenism] is already at work. Only let him who thus far hinders it be removed, and then the LAW-LESS ONE shall be manifested whom the Lord Jesus will destroy by the breath of his mouth and shall annihilate by the brightness of his appearing, [that LAWLESS ONE] whose appearing among those who are to be destroyed is, through the working of Satan, [to be] with all power and false signs and wonders and with every unjust means of misleading, because they would not accept that love of the truth which would save them; and on this account God will send them a deceitful working [of miracles] so that they will believe what is false, that all may be condemned who do not believe the truth, but find pleasure in injustice." — **2 Thess. 2**, 1–12.

A comparison of the Sibylline passage (**3**, 63–92), cited on pp. 138–140, will leave scarcely a doubt that Paul, for the time being, shared some of the Jewish expectations which originated since Caligula's time. There are some to whom a discovery of this will be painful. May I suggest to such, that they examine the facts carefully, but without mistrusting the result. It was for the Deity, not for us, to determine in how far the minds of the apostles — subordinate agents in the introduction of Chris-

was especially the apostle to the Gentiles, and that the letter was written to Gentiles in a city whence he had been driven by Jews, we can better conceive the powerful hold which this Jewish conception had already gained on the minds of men. The apostle mentions, as already KNOWN TO THE THESSALONIANS, some one who temporarily restrained the expected manifestation of heathenism. This person must have been the younger Agrippa, long in the household of,[156] and at that date revisiting, Claudius.[156a] Paul seems to have had a good opinion of him;[157] and the known facts of his life show him to have been a much better man than his father.

Paul's belief in a speedy coming of his master did not divert his attention from ordinary duties;[158] and he seems some years afterwards to have regarded the Christians at Rome as not wholly free from blame, or at least as needing to be cautioned.[159] Excitement in the community

---

tianity — needed to be freed by supernatural agency from the errors of their time.

[156] Josephus, *Antiq.* **19**, 9, 2. [156a] Idem, *Wars*, **2**, 12, 7.

[157] "King Agrippa, do you believe the prophets? I know that you believe them." — **Acts 26**, 27.

[158] "We exhort you . . . to emulate quiet, to attend to your own business, to work with your own hands . . . that your relations to THOSE OUTSIDE may be appropriate, and [also] that you be dependent on no one." — **1 Thess. 4**, 10–12. "See that no one returns evil for evil to any one; but endeavor to show kindness not only to each other, but to ALL MEN." — **1 Thess. 5**, 15.

[159] "Let every one show subordination to the authorities over him. No authority exists save by [permission of] God. Existing ones are [to be regarded as] God's appointments, so that whoever is insubordinate to such authority opposes God's appointment. But such opposers will bring judgment on themselves. For rulers are not a cause of terror to [doers of] good works, but to [doers of] evil. Do you wish to have no fear of the officer? Do what is good and you shall have his praise. For he is God's servant for your good. But, if you do evil, fear him, for it is not without object that he carries a sword; since he is God's avenging servant for the punishment of the evil doer. Wherefore subordination should be shown, not merely from dread of punishment, but for conscience sake.

"This also is the reason of your paying tribute. For they are God's

must have been strong, if one so practical as Paul shared it so largely.

If we now turn to the Chronicon of Eusebius, as given by Jerome, we shall find under the twelfth year of Claudius,[160] that is, in the year A. D. 52, that the apostle Philip was affixed to a cross and stoned at Hierapolis in the small province called Asia.[161] Crucifixion implies Roman agency, and stoning implies participation by Jews. The Chronicon ignores all those other events of the year which have been given. It cannot, therefore, have been biassed by them in assigning the date. The disposition to make Christians responsible for the Messianic excitement must have reached from Rome to Hierapolis. This latter city, according to a Jewish writer, was "wedded to wealth alone," [162] which means, doubtless, that it was very conservative. Paul, though mentioning Christians there,[163] does not speak of having ever set foot within its borders.

Hitherto any Jewish indignation against Christians would seem to have come exclusively from conservatives. There is, however, in the Sibylline Oracles a passage, belonging either to A. D. 52, or A. D. 65, and certainly not from a conservative hand, which wears the appearance of

---

ministers attending to this business. Render, therefore, your dues to all; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear [in the sense of obedience] to whom fear; honor to whom honor." — **Rom. 13,** 1–7.

[160] See Jerome's Works, ed. Vallarsius, Vol. **8,** col. 665, 666. The reader must not be misled by the year 54 affixed thereto. The same year is meant which other chronologers call 52, namely, the twelfth of Claudius.

[161] Philip was the apostle to whom Gentiles (literally Greeks) came when they wished to see Jesus, as we are told in John **12,** 21. It is not improbable, therefore, that he would be among the first of the twelve to commence work in a heathen land. **Polycrates** who became pastor or bishop of Ephesus near the close of the second century (Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* **5,** 22), is quoted by Eusebius (*Ecc. Hist.* **5,** 24) as saying that the apostle Philip had "fallen asleep" at Hierapolis.

[162] **Sibyl. Orac. 5,** 318.

[163] Coloss. **4,** 13.

an unfriendly allusion to them, or to the Gentile portion of them.[164]

The reaction against Judaism in A. D. 52 helps to explain the extra scale on which people were made to kill each other for popular amusement.[165] If Paul's Epistle to the Galatians were written, as generally supposed, shortly after those to the Thessalonians, we have in it testimony to a sudden growth among Christians there of zeal for Jewish observances, which implies some such sudden alienation from Gentiles as the events of the year at Rome would explain.[166]

An indirect result of the excitement in A. D. 52 was the origin at the close of that year, or early in 53, of an institution which, in one or a different shape, is now, with slight exceptions, universal throughout Christendom; the institution of religious gatherings on the first day of the week, subsequently called Sunday. Paul previously, though teaching, doubtless, when opportunity offered, had not, so far as we can judge from the record, set apart any day but the Sabbath for his regular public ministrations.[167]

---

[164] "The harvest is near when instead of Prophets,
Certain deceivers shall arrive blabbing upon earth.
And Beliar shall come and shall do many wonders
[Before mortals. Then shall subversion of righteous men,
And robbery of the chosen and faithful, take place;
Of these, to wit (?) Hebrews, and terrible anger shall come upon them.]"
Sibyl. Orac. 2, 165–170.

If the above translation be adopted, the whole passage may be from one hand, that of a Jew. If in the last line the translation "and" be substituted for "to wit," the part in brackets would seem to come from a Jewish Christian, and must belong to A. D. 64 or 65. The first three lines may, in that case, have previously existed, or may be an allusion to Paul's teaching. On this latter supposition also the whole passage might be from one hand, that of a Jewish Christian. Compare Ch. VI. § v.

[165] See Ch. V. note 12.

[166] "I wonder that you have so soon transferred yourselves . . . to another GLAD-TIDINGS, which is no glad-tidings." — **Galat. 1,** 6. Paul had passed through Galatia (Acts **16,** 6) shortly before entering Greece.

[167] Even at Thessalonica, shortly before Paul's arrival at Corinth, though his converts were mostly Gentiles (see note 144), yet his public

Circumstances at Corinth called for a different course. He had separated from the Jews and founded a society mainly of Gentiles, which met in the house of a Gentile Christian near the synagogue.[168] If these Gentiles had kept the Sabbath, the law to which they were amenable would probably, during the existing reaction against Judaism, have been enforced against them. This may have prompted Paul, who did not regard the Sabbath as binding, to initiate a different stated day for meeting. The first allusion to this stated day is in his letter to the Christians at this place.[169] After leaving Corinth he separated in like manner from the Jews at Ephesus, and taught in the school of one Tyrannus, a Gentile, as we may judge from his name. Subsequently to this separation we find a second allusion to the first day of the week as, apparently, a STATED day of meeting.[170] The locality of the custom is a small seaport, considerably north of Ephesus, through which much of the travel between the latter city and Macedonia seems to have passed.

Claudius died in A. D. 54. Rarely has any community rivalled Pandemonium more successfully than Rome did during his reign. Justice was venal. No pretence of it was made towards slaves or freedmen.[171] A foreigner had no chance of it unpurchased against a citizen.[172]

---

services were (Acts **17**, 2) on the Sabbath. The gathering of the apostles (John **20**, 19, 26) bears no resemblance to a setting apart of the day for PUBLIC SERVICES.

[168] Acts **18**, 6, 7.

[169] 1 Cor. **16**, 2.

[170] Acts **20**, 7.

[171] Sueton. *Claud.* 25, quoted in note on p. 87.

[172] "Since in all things the Romans had preference given them over foreigners, many petitioned him for it [Roman citizenship] and bought it from Messalina and the emperor's favorites; and on this account, though bought at first for great sums, it afterwards by repetition became so cheap as to cause a proverb that 'by giving a broken glass vessel you will be made a citizen.'" — **Dio Cassius, 60**, 17. About five years after the death of Claudius a military tribune told Paul, "I paid a large sum for this citizenship." — **Acts 22**, 28. The De Morte Claudii Ludus (**3**,) represents one of the Fates as saying that she had forborne a little to

Consequently sale of citizenship became a vast traffic, bringing enormous revenues to such as controlled it. Brutality equalled venality. The watchword which Claudius repeatedly gave the soldiers [173] may have been due only to prevalent vindictiveness, or may have been intended to confront the humanizing precepts of monotheism.

§ VI. *A. D.* 54-62. *Earlier Years of Nero's Reign.*

The accession of Nero, with such ministers and counsellors as Burrhus and Seneca, placed the government more in accord with human rights and human improvement. Taking life in public games, whether at Rome or elsewhere, was prohibited.[174] Distaste for wars of conquest showed itself by a proposition to withdraw the troops from Britain.[175] A man entitled to freedom had his right recognized, much to the disgust of ultra-patricianism.[176]

Under these circumstances, it is possible that converts to Judaism or to monotheism may have been less on their guard. The reactionaries singled out for their attack a lady of rank, Pomponia, a relative doubtless, and perhaps a sister of the Pomponius whom they had persecuted in the reigns of Tiberius and Caligula. A friend of this lady, a granddaughter of Tiberius, had in the reign of Claudius been banished and murdered, without opportunity of answer to the charges against her.[177] Pomponia

---

despatch Claudius, that he might have time to make a present of citizenship to the few of mankind who had not yet received it.

[173] "To strike a man when he has already offered provocation." — **Dio Cass. 60,** 16. Compare Homer, *Odyssey*, **16,** 72, **21,** 133, whence it is taken with omission of its connection. Another historian says, that the above watchword was almost sure to be given "when at any time he had taken vengeance on an enemy or a conspirator." — **Sueton.** *Claud.* 42, Bohn's trans.

[174] See quotations and references on p. 79.

[175] Sueton. *Nero*, **18.**

[176] Tac. *An.* **13,** 27, quoted on p. 87.

[177] Dio Cass. **60,** 18; Sueton. *Claud.* **29.**

had put on mourning for her friend so unjustly treated, and had worn it ever afterwards. This could not legally be charged against her, though it and the sympathy which it implied towards the popular party had probably much to do with the accusation. She was charged with Foreign Superstition. The administration did not, perhaps, feel strong enough simply to ignore or dismiss such a charge; but under old precedent the matter was turned over to her husband, who in the presence of relatives acquitted her.[178]

In A. D. 62 Nero, after repudiating his previous wife, married Poppæa. She was professedly, as will hereafter appear, a monotheist, though, after due allowance for misrepresentation by Tacitus, she can have done little honor to her profession, and seems to have imitated Jewish customs rather than moral aims. The friendship of her father with Sejanus[179] implies that he belonged to the popular party, and is another instance of a connection between monotheism and popular rights.

§ VII. *A. D.* 63–70. *Fire at Rome. Jewish War. Persecution of Christians.*

In the beginning of A. D. 63, fearful earthquakes shook Southern Italy.[180] The universal apprehension may have

---

[178] Tac. *An.* **13**, 32. See in Appendix, Note G, foot-notes 86, 88, and text prefixed, a baffled effort of the Senate to forbid mourning.

[179] Tac. *An.* **13**, 45.

[180] "We have heard, Lucilius, most excellent of men, that Pompeii, a celebrated city of Campania, has settled . . . because of an earthquake, by which the adjoining regions have suffered, and this during the winter, when our ancestors were accustomed to promise immunity from such evils. On the nones [that is, on the 5th] of February, in the consulship of Regulus and Virginius, this shock occurred, which devastated with great havoc Campania, [a section] never secure from this evil, but hitherto unharmed and let off with a fright. Part of Herculaneum is in ruins, and the remainder is in a precarious condition. . . . Solace must be found for those in trepidation, and the intense fright must be remedied. For what can seem safe to any one if the world itself shakes and its most solid portion gives way? . . . No [other] evil is without some means of escape. . . .

stimulated Messianic expectations among Jews and Christians.

In the month of June, 64, the city of Rome was nearly destroyed by a fire. Out of fourteen sections of the city only four remained untouched. The other ten were nearly or wholly destroyed. Here was an event — Rome's destruction — which for more than a century had by many Jews been deemed the precursor of their Messiah's coming. Party strife and Sibylline predictions found place in the capital,[181] whilst in Judæa the autumn cannot have

---

This [alone] is widespread, inevitable, . . . for it not only swallows homes, or families, or cities, but nations, and overthrows whole sections of country. At one time it buries them under ruins, at another it hides them in a deep gulf, and leaves no trace whereby the former existence of what has passed away can be discerned. Above most distinguished cities, the soil extends with no vestige of former habitation.

"Nor are there wanting those who fear this kind of death more, by which they go, homes and all, into the abyss, and are borne alive from the number of the living; as if all fate did not lead to the same goal. . . . It matters not whether one stone destroy me, or whether I am crushed by a mountain, . . . whether I give up my spirit in the light and the unconfined [air] or in the vast bosom of the gaping earth; whether I descend alone into the deep, or with a great accompaniment of perishing nations. It matters not what tumult accompanies my death. It itself is the same everywhere.

"Let us take courage against a destruction which can neither be avoided nor foreseen. Let us cease listening to those who have renounced Campania, who after this calamity have emigrated and affirm that they will never go near that region. Who will promise that this or that ground stands on better foundation? . . . We err if we think that any part of the earth is excepted and exempt from this danger." — **Seneca**, *Nat. Quæst.* **6**, 1, 1-3, 6-10.

[181] According to Dio Cassius, the common people revived the verse which had caused disturbance in the time of Tiberius: —

> "When thrice three hundred years are accomplished,
> INTERNAL SEDITION shall destroy the Romans.

"And when Nero by way of admonition told them that these words were nowhere found [in the Oracles], they, changing them, sang another Oracle as veritably Sibylline.

"It is as follows: —

> "Last of the Æneadæ a matricide shall reign."

Dio Cass. 62, 18.

passed without premonitions of rebellion.[182] Anti-Jewish policy at Rome soon displaced a previous favoritism towards the Jews. Poppæa, their convert and advocate, was, it is alleged, killed by a kick from Nero.

The rebellion in Judæa broke out formally in the spring of 65. In the autumn of that year a Roman legion from Syria marched to Jerusalem, with no great zeal apparently for its capture, and retreated again.[183] The conservative Jews undertook to quiet matters, and for a year or more seem to have been allowed their way. Josephus, who acted at first with these conservatives, and went as their envoy to Galilee, was bought over by the revolutionists. At the expiration of about a year Florus was murdered, probably by some of the guerillas whom Josephus commanded.[184] Thereupon the Roman forces under Vespasian, A. D. 67, marched into Galilee, the bands under Josephus scattered, and he, according to his own account (*Wars*, **3**, 6, 3; **3**, 7, 2, 3), fled to Jotapata, where, after a short siege at that or a later date, he was taken prisoner. By this time the death of Nero and the course of events at Rome led Vespasian to aim at imperial power. While its attainment was undecided, he either did not care to increase Jewish enmity towards himself, or else did not wish to spare troops for the Jewish war. It was intermitted for

---

[182] Josephus, who was born in the first year of Caligula, that is, in the year A. D. 37, went to Rome shortly after he was twenty-six years old, not later, therefore, than the winter of 63 – 64. After seeing Poppæa, and obtaining what he asked, he returned directly, as it seems, to Judæa, and found the revolutionary disturbances already beginning. See Josephus, *Life*, §§ 1, 3, 4.

[183] Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 19, 7–9; **7**, 1, 3.

[184] **Suetonius**, who habitually groups facts without reference to chronological arrangement, says (*Vespasian*, **4**), that the Jews "had rebelled, having murdered their governor, and moreover had put to flight and captured a military eagle from the consular lieutenant of Syria, who was bringing assistance."

If by the consular lieutenant be meant Cestius Gallus, who was defeated in the autumn of 65, the murder of Gessius Florus cannot have occurred for nearly or quite a year afterwards.

some time, and completed by his son Titus, who in A. D. 70 captured Jerusalem.[185]

We will now return to events at Rome consequent on the fire. That an anti-Roman excitement among Jews should afford to patricians occasion for a reaction against them is natural. That some of the reactionaries should have attributed the fire to a people who had long anticipated and predicted Rome's destruction, is also natural. But so far as we have information, the only prosecutions were directed against such Jews as had become Christians, and some remarks are requisite in explanation of this. Poppæa, Nero's wife, was a convert to Judaism, and was surrounded by Jews,[186] — facts which throw light on two statements of Tacitus concerning her.[187] That the class of Jews who surrounded her should have sought her aid in attempts to divert the storm from themselves is a matter of course. That they should have obtained it is probable. That the Christian portion of their countrymen should be selected as scapegoat was inevitable, since no other was to be found. A similar charge against Christians in A. D. 52 had obtained partial credence. At present any aid from Poppæa was perhaps supplemented by Tigellinus.[188]

---

[185] See, for further details of this Jewish rebellion, the Appendix, Note I.

[186] On the monotheism of Poppæa, see the direct affirmation of Josephus, *Antiq.* **20**, 8, 11, quoted in Note B, 1. 2, of the Appendix. As to her Jewish surroundings, compare Josephus, *Life*, § 3, according to which Josephus gained her acquaintance through a Jew, and preferred a petition to her rather than to Nero.

[187] Tacitus tells us (*An.* **13**, 45) that whenever Poppæa went out, her face was partially veiled ; and (*An.* **16**, 6) when she died, her body, instead of being burnt according to Roman customs, was embalmed with spices. Both of these accord with Jewish customs. Tacitus endeavors to hide this by comparing her embalming to that of foreign KINGS.

[188] Tigellinus, Nero's chief political favorite at this time, had hitherto co-operated with Poppæa. Possibly he had a special motive of his own also for acting against Christians. The following remarks of Juvenal have always been understood as relating to them, and imply plainness of speech in one or more of their number : —

The two charges brought against Christians strengthen the belief that they originated in an effort to divert odium from Jews. The first was that they had destroyed Rome. This was an event which one class of Jews since more than a century had predicted and longed for. Of this crime the Christians were adjudged innocent, but, according to Tacitus, they were found guilty of "hatred to mankind";[189] a charge borrowed, like the other, from

---

"Describe Tigellinus, you will shine in that kind of a torch
Wherein they, standing, burn, who smoke, fastened by their throats,
And [who does so] draws [but] a broad furrow in the midst of sand."
Juvenal, *Satire*, **1**, 155–157.

The last line admits more than one translation. I understand it as meaning that the outspoken individual has lost his labor. The passage seems inapplicable, except to the Christians who were thus burned in the gardens of Nero.

[189] The statements of **Tacitus** are anything but lucid. He assumes in the first place — though without assigned reason and contrary to probability — that Nero set fire to the city. This is at first doubtfully expressed (*An.* **15**, 40): "Nero seemed to seek the glory of founding a new city and of calling it by his name."

Next we are told (*An.* **15**, 44): "Neither by human aid nor by liberality of the prince nor by pacifications of the gods could the disgrace be removed of a general belief that he had ordered the conflagration. Therefore, to end this rumor, Nero SUBSTITUTED as criminals, and inflicted the severest torments on, those — hated because of their crimes — whom the common people call Christians." According to this, the Christians were innocent. The term "substitute" seems to assume Nero's guilt.

Tacitus afterwards continues: "Therefore, at first, some were seized who confessed [what ?]. Then by their testimony a great multitude were convicted, not so MUCH of having set the city on fire [were they convicted of partly doing this ?] as of hatred for the human race." If we understand that those first seized confessed having fired the city, their confession would flatly contradict the prior statement by Tacitus, that they had been SUBSTITUTED as criminals. If we understand Tacitus to affirm that they confessed hatred towards the human race, a plausible explanation is that they admitted believing the salvation of Christians, and perdition of all others. It was easy to select for seizure a few narrow-minded and vehement persons, to whose views slight perversion would

a prevalent allegation against Jews.[190] Whether the charge that Nero set fire to the city had been openly circulated before the Christians were persecuted, whether it was skilfully used by those who prompted their persecution, or whether it grew up afterwards, may admit question. According to Dio Cassius no mention was made of Nero as the incendiary.[191] The remark, too, already quoted, of Tacitus in his *Annals*, **15**, 40, points rather to a suspicion, which was only likely to grow months later, after the rubbish had been removed and Nero's plans for a new city, including a very extensive palace, had been matured and made public. Possibly there was time for this suspicion to grow before the Christians were arraigned.[192] Yet it is plain that if Nero had charged Christians with firing the city, they would have been des-

---

give the appearance of hatred to mankind. A more probable view is that Tacitus, wishing to malign Nero and the Christians, was indifferent to truth or consistency in his statements. His phraseology treats hatred to mankind and the firing of the city as TWO DIFFERENT GRADES OF THE SAME CRIME cognizable under the law.

[190] **Josephus** says of Apion: "He belies our oath [charging us] as swearing by the God who made the heaven and the earth and the sea, to bear no good-will to other nations; especially not to Greeks." — *Against Apion*, **2**, 10 (Whiston's trans. **2**, 11). Elsewhere he quotes from the same writer a silly charge that some Greek whom the Jews were fattening in their temple had been found and rescued by Antiochus; that, according to the tale of this rescued man, they annually fattened and sacrificed a Greek; after tasting whose entrails (compare Ch. X. note 126) they swore hatred against Greeks. See Josephus, *Against Apion*, **2**, 8 (there are two chapters 8 in the Latin). As Antiochus lived in the second century before Christ, there was no risk of eye-witnesses remaining to contradict the story.

[191] "The people steadily cursed Nero, NOT that they [even] whispered his name, but they cursed those who had set fire to the city." — **Dio Cass. 62**, 18.

[192] **Tacitus** details at length (*An.* **15**, 43) the removal of rubbish from the city in vessels to the marshes, as also the plans for the remodelled city. In chapter 44 he continues: "Afterwards, *mox*, expiations for the gods were sought." The persecution of the Christians is mentioned as something still later.

titute of aid from patricians, and would not have been pronounced innocent thereof. Their acquittal under this, the only charge in which Nero could have been personally interested, shows that HE was not their accuser. The real accusers, whoever they might be, had been defeated on this point.

Extant statements of Paul and also the seizure of Christian leaders in lands distant from Rome, where they could not have taken part in firing the city, are best explained on the supposition that Jews were trying to throw blame on the Christians.

Paul's seizure can be partly elucidated from his own writings. He had previously come to Rome a prisoner, probably in the spring of 62. The Jewish tendencies and surroundings of Poppæa facilitated the ministry on which he entered in the palace.[193] At one time he seems to have had hope of reaching imperial ears. He speaks of Christianity as being "made known to governments and authorities in heaven-high positions."[194] In a later letter,

---

[193] "I wish you to know, brethren, that my affairs have turned out for the advancement of the gospel, so that my bonds as a Christian are manifest (or, perhaps, "my bonds bear testimony to my being a Christian") throughout the whole palace." — **Philip. 1**, 12, 13. By the palace must be understood an aggregate of buildings. The gardens seem to have been large enough (Tacitus, *An.* **15**, 44) for chariot racing.

[194] The connected passage may aid the reader in comprehending subsequent quotations from **Paul**, for which reason it is here given somewhat fully: "If you have heard . . . that by a revelation was made known to me THE SECRET . . . which was not made known, in former generations, to the sons of men as it has now been revealed to his [God's] consecrated apostles and teachers by [a communication from] the spirit, [namely], THAT THE GENTILES ARE FELLOW HEIRS AND A CONJOINT BODY [with other Christians] and JOINT PARTAKERS OF HIS PROMISE IN [relation to the sending of] CHRIST, by means of that glad-tidings whereof I became the minister. . . . To me, one of the very least among all the consecrated, this favor was given that I should carry the glad-tidings to the Gentiles . . . and should enlighten all concerning the working of THE SECRET, which has been concealed since ages in [the mind of] God the Creator of all things, that now, through the [Christian]

written during his second imprisonment,[195] his tone is that of disappointment, but his illustration corroborates the idea that he had an imperial personage among others in mind. He speaks of women perpetually learning, yet never attaining a recognition of the truth, and men who — as the Egyptian magicians had prevented their monarch from listening to Moses — prevented these from listening to Paul.[196]

---

assembly [which I have gathered] God's DIVERSIFIED wisdom [opening a way to Gentiles as to Jews] might be made known to governments and authorities in heaven-high positions." — **Ephesians, 3,** 2-10.

[195] Paul during his first imprisonment must have written Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. The epistle to Titus and the first one to Timothy were written during his liberation. The second one to Timothy was written after he had been the second time brought to Rome. The phraseology of the letters to Timothy and Titus is so similar as to show that they were written at no great interval from each other.

Paul's epistles ought to be rearranged in our English translations. The present arrangement consists in putting first those to societies and afterwards those to individuals; the arrangement in each class being according to size, without regard to date. The epistle to the Hebrews, not by Paul, has been subjoined to his writings as doubtful.

Probably Paul was liberated from his first imprisonment early in 64. He seems to have sailed for Asia Minor by the way of Crete, at which island he left Titus (Titus **1,** 5). From Asia Minor he made a flying visit to Philippi in Macedonia (1 Tim. **1,** 3; **3,** 14, 15). From there he must have returned to Asia Minor and been seized within its bounds. He was brought to Rome by way of Miletus and Corinth, for he left Trophimus sick at the former place, and Erastus stopped at the latter (2 Tim. **4,** 20). He had intended spending the winter at Nicopolis (Titus **3,** 12), and with this intention had left some manuscripts and a valise at Troas (2 Tim. **4,** 13), through which place doubtless he expected to repass.

[196] "Know this, that in the last days times will be difficult. Men will be selfish, avaricious, . . . lovers of pleasure rather than of God; having an outside appearance of practical-monotheism, but renouncing its [proper] working. Avoid such, for of this class are those who make their way into families and captivate weak women with accumulated faults, fluctuating under various desires, perpetually learning, but never able to reach a RECOGNITION of the truth. After the same fashion that

Although the apostle probably had at Rome, as elsewhere, some trouble from Judaizing Christians, yet his chief difficulty, as portrayed in his later letters, seems to have been with unprincipled Jews, who had, as a convenience to themselves, adopted his teaching, that the Mosaic law was not binding, but with this difference, that he had in view the ceremonial, and they the moral law. They probably knew enough to substitute ceremonial observances for morality in adapting themselves to the inclinations of the women whom they wished to influence. Paul had come into collision with such Jews, nominal adherents of Christianity,[197] and one who, during

---

Jannes and Jambres [the Egyptian magicians] withstood Moses, thus do these men withstand the truth, men corrupt in mind, spurious as regards the faith. But they shall make no further progress, for their senselessness shall be as thoroughly manifested to all as was that of those [magicians]." — **2 Tim. 3**, 1–9.

A catalogue of vices in these men is omitted, that attention may not be diverted from their having given a spurious adhesion to Christianity, and also from their having apparently stood between Paul and the throne, which Poppæa, for the time, practically occupied.

[197] "Having . . . a good conscience, by discarding which some have made shipwreck of the faith, of whom are Hymenæus and Alexander, whom I have delivered over to Satan [turned out of Christ's assembly into that of Satan, or into heathenism] that they may be taught not to calumniate." — **1 Tim. 1**, 19, 20. "A pillar and basis of the truth and confessedly grand is THE [little-recognized] SECRET OF PRACTICAL-MONOTHEISM, . . . but the spirit expressly says that in the last times some will fall away from the faith [compare 2 Thes. **2**, 3, quoted on p. 236], adhering to deceitful spirits and to teachings of demons [that is, of heathenized men], hypocritical falsifiers, cauterized in their own conscience, preventing marriage, teaching abstinence from meats. . . . Renounce impure and old-womanish fables. Exercise yourself in practical-monotheism. This asceticism is of little use. Practical-monotheism is useful in every way." — **1 Tim. 3**, 15; **4**, 1–3, 7, 8. "Keep away from impure gossips, for they will make progress yet further into heathenism, and their teaching eats its way like a gangrene; of whom are Hymenæus and Philetus, who as regards the truth have been a failure, saying that 'the resurrection is already past,' and they upset the faith of some. Yet God's foundation stands firm, having [as evidence of authenticity] this seal, 'The Lord knows his own,' and 'Let every one who calls

Paul's trial, did him many ill turns, had the same name, and may have been the same person, as one of those with whom he had previously come into conflict.[198]

If Paul had been the only prominent Christian outside of Rome who was brought thither, and if none had suffered elsewhere as Christians, we might attribute his second imprisonment to mere personal feeling, whether from Jews in the palace or in Asia,[199] and might have regarded the persecution of other Christians at Rome as not implying, or connected with, any effort of Jews elsewhere to make Christians responsible for the anti-Roman feeling which was rapidly gaining strength. According, however, to the concurrent testimony of early

---

on the Lord's name [that is, who professes to belong to him] abstain from wrong-doing." — **2 Tim. 2,** 16-19.

Paul, at a former date (1 Cor. **7,** 8, 25-28, 32-34, 38), had expressed opinions concerning the inexpediency of marriage in view of impending troubles. His experience in Nero's palace, or in the city of Rome, would seem to have overruled his objections, as we may infer, not indeed from his indignation above expressed, at those who, dishonestly as he thought, opposed marriage, but from his statement 1 Tim. **5,** 11, 14.

[198] "Alexander the coppersmith has done me much injury (or, many ill turns) . . . against whom be you also on your guard, for he has excessively [or, vehemently] contradicted my statements." — **2 Tim. 4,** 14, 15.

[199] **Paul** writes to **Timothy** (2 Tim. **1,** 15), "You know that all in Asia [the small province around Ephesus] have turned away from me." He had just previously (2 Tim. **1,** 10-12) spoken of Christ as having "done away with death and brought life and incorruption to light through the glad-tidings, of which I was made a herald, apostle, and teacher among the Gentiles; ON WHICH ACCOUNT also I suffer these things." Shortly afterwards he says (2 Tim. **2,** 8, 9): "Remember Jesus Christ, who has been raised from the dead, — a descendant of David, — according to my glad-tidings, in whom I suffer, even to bonds as an EVIL-DOER." The last word makes it plain that Paul was charged with crime. The date of the accusation leaves little doubt that the crime charged was privity to setting the city on fire. His statement as to why he had been charged admits difference of interpretation. It alleges hatred either because of his mission to the Gentiles, or because of his advocating the resurrection, concerning which latter he had had trouble with Jews in the palace. Perhaps the Jews in Asia were prompted by one motive and those in the palace by a different one.

Christian writers, Peter was also during this persecution put to death at Rome,[200] a man neither known nor likely to have been thought of there,[201] unless sent as a prisoner from his own locality. The statement, moreover, of James the Less implies action by Jewish conservatives against Christians,[202] and a remaining record of his own death implies that he fell somewhat later a victim to the same.[203]

A passage in the Sibylline Oracles treats the Christian sufferers of this date as JEWS.[204] This would be inher-

---

[200] Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* **2**, 25. Origen, *Comment. in Genes.* Tom. **3** (*Opp.* **2**, p. 24 B., edit. de la Rue; *Opp.* **8**, p. 48, edit. Lommatzsch). Orosius, **8**, 7, p. 473. Sulpic. Severus, *Hist. Sac.* Lib. **2**, (in De la Bigne, *Bibliotheca*, Vol. **7**, col. 269 B.)

[201] Paul's previous experience illustrates this. When he for the first time reached Rome he found (Acts **28**, 21) that even the leading Jews had heard nothing concerning his difficulties in Judæa, though these had now lasted over two years. How much less likely were the Gentiles to have known concerning Peter!

[202] "Do not the rich oppress you and drag you before tribunals? Do they not calumniate the excellent name by which you are called?" — **James 2**, 6, 7.

[203] Hegesippus in his fifth book gave a narrative concerning the death of James, which Eusebius has copied into his *Ecc. History*, **4**, 23, and which will be found in Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, Vol. **1**, pp. 208 - 212. It is disfigured by the weakness of its author, yet its two prominent points are not improbable. He states that the conservative Jews wished to make use of James, and, failing in this, put him to death. This took place probably more than a year after Nero's persecution, during the twelvemonth when Judæa was handed over or relinquished by the Roman authorities to the Jewish aristocracy.

[204] The **Sibylline writer** says (**5**, 149, 150) of Nero: —

"He seized the God-begotten temple and burnt [his fellow] citizens,
The 'PEOPLES,' who went up into it, whom he had justly praised with hymns."

The full passage will be found in Note F, § II. No. 1, of the Appendix. Nero must have made Jewish praise the object of some musical effort or efforts. On the meaning of "Peoples," see Appendix, Note B, § I. No. 13. Alexandre substitutes, conjecturally, "temple" for "Peoples," but Nero ceased to be emperor two years before the temple's destruction. The seizure of the temple may refer to a temporary seizure at the beginning of the rebellion, when the money in its treasury was taken away.

ently probable if, as in the year 52, leading Jews were endeavoring to saddle on this portion of their countrymen the odium of any feeling against the Romans, which was likely otherwise to be attributed to their whole body. The only sufferers known to us by name were Christian Jews.

The reader should, in this connection, remember that there are constituent parts either in conservatism,[205] or in any other general classification of mankind, and that the personal character and feelings of those in one constituent part may differ greatly from those in another. Among those Jews who regarded Christians as fanatics and as having caused expulsion — with its consequent loss and inconvenience — to their non-Christian brethren in A. D. 52, there were men who must have revolted with horror from the present treatment of Christians.

Seneca and other distinguished Romans, almost immediately after the atrocities against Christians, were charged with conspiracy against Nero. Poppæa and Tigellinus were present with Nero when the order to Seneca for his self-destruction was sent.[206] Poppæa's influence cannot at most have lasted much more than a month afterwards, if we may judge by the date of Nero's order transferring Cæsarea from Jewish to Gentile control.[207]

Although the Jewish rebellion did not extend outside

---

[205] I use the terms "conservatism" and "conservatives," for lack of better ones, to designate all who, from whatever motives, see with reluctance, or oppose with greater or less vehemence, decided changes in society. The terms include wealthy persons anxious for their property, and poorer persons anxious for their gains. They include those who adhere, either thoughtfully or from prejudice, or as a matter of personal feeling, to old views. They include those who rely more on steady growth than they do either on noisy excitements, or on ideas which profess to revolutionize; those too who have less distrust of themselves and of others in dealing with well-known evils than in dealing with novel ones. They include some of the truest-hearted and some of the worst of men.

[206] Tacitus, *Annals*, **15**, 61.

[207] According to Josephus (*Wars*, **2**, 14, 4), the order had already been put in execution at Cæsarea before the breaking out of the rebellion in the month of Artemisius. This month seems, in the ASIATIC calendar, to have begun about the 24th of March; see Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 225.

of Jewish borders, yet the prevailing excitement chilled, or imbittered, everywhere the relations between Jews and Gentiles. This appears chiefly in the writings of Christians, they being composed of both parties. The statement of Paul has been quoted (p. 251 n.), that all — meaning doubtless all Jewish Christians — in [the province of] Asia had fallen away from him. A passage of the Apocalypse written during this rebellion tells the Christian assembly at Ephesus: "You have tried those who call themselves apostles, but who are not, and you found them deceivers."[208] A prominent Gentile, on the other hand, seems to have eschewed association even with an apostle of Jewish origin.[209]

Intensified Jewish feeling makes itself visible in the disposition of Jewish Christians to forsake their new for their old faith,[210] and in a commendation by John of hos-

---

[208] Apocalypse, or Revelation, **2**, 2. The ultra-Jewish Christians at no time before or after Paul's death used his writings. During his lifetime his apostleship was denied by them, not merely in Judæa, but in churches which he himself had founded; see 1 Cor. **9**, 1, 2.

[209] The name Diotrephes, meaning "nurtured by Jupiter," indicates that the bearer of it was of Gentile origin. The apostle John says to Gaius: "I wrote to the assembly, but Diotrephes, who likes pre-eminence over them, DOES NOT RECEIVE US. Therefore, if I come, I will put him in mind of his doings, spreading evil reports about us. And not content with these things, he does not receive THE BRETHREN [the Jewish Christians], and hinders and ejects from the assembly those who wish [to receive them]." — **3 John**, 9, 10. Diotrephes probably feared to lose civil or social standing by fraternizing with Jews. The praise given, in verse 12, to Demetrius, also of Gentile origin if we may judge from his name, was perhaps because his Gentile surroundings did not prevent kindliness towards his brethren of Jewish descent.

[210] The **Epistle to the Hebrews**, written apparently after the death of Peter (Heb. **13**, 7) by some Alexandrine Christian, possibly by Apollos, when the persecution at Rome was subsiding and when Timothy had been set at liberty (Heb. **13**, 23), has for one of its main objects to prevent Jewish Christians from falling back into their old faith. The same seems to be the object of **John's** remark (1 John **2**, 23), "Whoever denies the Son hath not the Father; he who confesses the Son hath the Father too." Compare 1 John **2**, 19; **4**, 15; **5**, 1, 5, 10, 12; 2 John 9.

pitality towards Gentiles, which seems to imply that for the moment some were averse to practising it.[211] This mutual alienation may well have prompted the reiterated admonitions of John to mutual love.[212]

The present, like other reactionary periods, filled Rome with prosecutions for Unbelief.[213]

CHAPTER IX.

APOCALYPSE, OR BOOK OF CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

§ I. *Title and Authorship.*

DURING or immediately after the events narrated in the last section of the preceding chapter, a book called the "*Apocalypse*," that is, the "*Personal Appearing*" or the "*Manifestation*" of *Jesus Christ*,[1] was written by some

---

[211] "You [Gaius] are doing a true work in what you perform towards THE BRETHREN and towards THE FOREIGNERS, who in presence of the assembly have borne witness to your kindness; whom you do well to assist on their way in a manner worthy [a worshipper] of God. For on account of the name [of Christian] they came out, destitute, from among the Gentiles. We ought, therefore, to accept such, that we may become fellow-workers [with them] in the truth."—**3 John** 5-8. In this and in the immediately following verses (9, 10), which have already been quoted, "brethren" seems to mean such travelling Christians as were Jews, and "foreigners" such as were Gentiles. The latter word, ξένοι, was used by Jews to designate Gentiles (Ephes. **2**, 12, 19; Matt. **27**, 7), and may have been retained sometimes by those of them who became Christians. Its retention was most likely on the part of Christians who associated much with Jews.

[212] See 1 John **2**, 9-11; **3**, 11, 14, 15, 23; **4**, 7, 8, 20, 21; 2 John 5. Compare James **1**, 19, 20.

[213] "Vespasian . . . sent [letters] to Rome to wipe out any stigma from the living or dead, who under Nero and his successors [Galba, Otho, and Vitellius] had been condemned for Unbelief, and quashing all such accusations."—**Dio Cass. 66**, 9.

[1] The common version "Revelation of Jesus Christ," in order that it

Jewish Christian named John. It throws light both on the persecution by Jewish conservatives and on the intensity of anti-Roman feeling among the ultra-Judaizing Christians, and seems to call for a special chapter.

In the SECOND century, Justin and Irenæus, semi-Jewish Christians, who could find their favorite doctrines of a Millennium and a New Jerusalem nowhere in the Christian records save in this book, allege or assume unhesitatingly that it was written by the APOSTLE John. Other brethren in that century, less tinctured with Jewish views, attribute it to a different author.[2] This discrepance in the second century could scarcely have existed had the apostle been its writer. If any reliance can be placed on style, the work was not written by the same person as the gospel and epistles of John.[2a] If any reliance can be placed on views taught, it was not from that apostle who gave the right hand of fellowship to Paul, that he should go to the Gentiles.[3] The book, aside from the passage already

---

may correspond with the Greek, must be understood as meaning, not a revelation made BY him, but a revealing of himself personally, as in 1 Cor. **1**, 7; 2 Thes. **1**, 7; 1 Pet. **1**, 7, 13; **4**, 13. Compare Luke **17**, 30, and also the revealing (2 Thes. **2**, 3, 6, 8) of the Lawless One.

[2] **Dionysius of Alexandria**, who flourished in the first half of the third century and who was born about its commencement, says: "SOME OF OUR PREDECESSORS rejected and totally discarded the book . . . they say that it is not from John. . . . I will not deny that he [the writer] was called John, and that this writing is from a John, . . . yet I would not readily concede that he was the apostle. . . . But I think that he was some other John, [one] of those who lived in Asia, since they say that there are two monuments at Ephesus, and each is said to be John's." — **Euseb.** *Ecc. Hist.* **7**, 25, Vol. **2**, pp. 374, 376, 378, 379, edit. Heinichen. Caius, an earlier writer than Dionysius, may be one of those meant; he denied apostolic authorship (Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* **3**, 28) to the book.

[2a] Compare the Evangelist's style in Ch. XII. § 2 of *Indirect Testimony.*

[3] "James, Cephas, and John . . . gave to me and Barnabas their right hands in fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles." — **Galat. 2**, 9. This agrees with the views of **John**, as stated in his gospel (**1**, 12, 13), that the Logos gave "the right of becoming God's children to those . . . who were born not of [particular] races, [or, more literally, 'bloods'] . . . but of God." It agrees also with his commendation of Gaius, be-

quoted, which bears strong appearance of condemning Paul,[4] is obviously Jewish in its teachings, and its manifestation of feeling towards Rome is fearful.

Attention to the geographical field of Paul's labors corroborates the view that a native, or lifelong inhabitant, of western Asia Minor wrote the book. Asia Minor was subdivided into smaller districts. One of these, called "Asia," lay in a semicircle around Ephesus, extending, approximately, for a hundred miles.[5] **Paul**, in his earlier missionary journeys, traversed the adjoining countries, but made no effort in this section,[6] whence we may infer that Jewish feeling there, as in Judæa, barred the way for his teachings. Afterwards he made an effort in Ephesus, but was obliged to form, in the school of a Gentile, an organization which must have been separate from that of more Jewish Christians.[7] Somewhat later, he writes: "I shall remain in Ephesus until Pentecost, for a great and practicable doorway is open, although there are many opponents."[8] After the fire in Rome, his statement, "You know that all in Asia have turned away from me,"[9] refers,

---

cause of his hospitality to Gentiles, as quoted in note 211 of the preceding chapter.

The fact that the apostle John was one of the three who sustained more intimate relations than other disciples with Jesus is additional evidence of his enlarged views. This and the direct testimony of Paul seem to have been overlooked by those who attribute the Apocalypse to the apostle, but the gospel to a different John.

[4] See Rev. **2**, 2, quoted on p. 254.

[5] Asia, according to the above limitation, had been bequeathed to the Romans by Attalus, in B. C. 133 (Smith, *Dict. of Geog.* Vol. **1**, p. 238, col. 2). The Romans, when appointing a governor, included neighboring provinces under the term "Asia," but the inhabitants of Asia Minor seem to have retained the name as a designation for the original fragment of territory. See Acts of the Apostles **2**, 9, 10; **16**, 6, 7; Rev. **1**, 4; and compare Acts **19**, 10, 22, 26.

[6] Acts **16**, 1, 6. [7] Acts **19**, 9; compare remarks on p. 240.

[8] **1 Cor. 16**, 8, 9. Some doings of these opponents may be seen in Acts **21**, 27, and their influence in 2 Tim. **1**, 15.

[9] **2 Tim. 1**, 15. Timothy, to whom this was addressed, would know its meaning. He knew that prevalent feeling in Asia might excite Jews

doubtless, to such Christians of JEWISH proclivities, in this section of Asia Minor, as had formerly adhered to him.

If we now turn to the Apocalypse we find it addressed to seven churches in this most Judaizing fraction of Asia Minor, all of them within eighty miles of Ephesus. The field of Paul's labors is totally ignored, except in the address to the Ephesians, which may well have been sympathy for their rejection of him. Not only this, but the churches of Judæa and Syria are ignored. The apostle John had, prior to the date of this book, labored almost exclusively in Judæa or its neighborhood. Had he originated the book, he could not have overlooked the field of his own labors, and forborne a word of counsel to it. Only by supposing that the writer was a Judaizing Christian, native of, or long resident in, this little precinct of Asia Minor, can we naturally account for his ignoring the remainder of the Christian world. The objections against deeming the book a work of John the apostle weigh with still greater force against the supposition that it is a communication from Jesus.

§ II. *Date.*

The book was written under the sixth Roman emperor,[10] which, as the writer lived in Asia, must mean Vespasian. This accords with the mention of a seventh, — Titus, doubtless, — who was yet to come.[11] It alludes to Nero's death,[12] and seems to imply destruction of the temple.[12a]

---

and their sympathizers against Paul, but this would have made Christians of Gentile proclivities defend him. Paul's admonitions to Timothy (2 Tim. **4**, 1, 2) imply that his views still found hearers. These must have been mainly Gentiles.

[10] Rev. **17**, 10. Compare Appendix, Note E.

[11] Titus had (see p. 272, note 5) been proclaimed emperor against his father, and had put on a crown, but gave up perhaps such claim for (see p. 271, note 4) a share in, or future promise of, the empire.

[12] Rev. **17**, 11.

[12a] Titus as coming emperor may imply that the temple was already destroyed. The new Jerusalem (Rev. **21**, 22) is without temple.

It must, therefore, have been completed after A. D. 68, and probably in, or soon after, A. D. 70. The first half of the book, concerning persecution of Christians by conservative Jews, may have been composed even earlier by a year or two.

§ III. *Divisions and Object.*

The book, aside from some introductory and concluding remarks (**1**, 1–8; **22**, 6–21), contains: 1. Admonitions to endurance and steadfastness; 2. A figurative explanation of how Jewish opposition was to be subdued; 3. A figurative explanation of how heathen opposition was to be subdued and punished. The first of these includes from chapter **1**, 9, to the end of chapter **3**; the second, chapters **4** to **11**; and the third, from chapter **12** to **22**, 5.

In order to appreciate the author's object we must recollect that not only among heathens, but also among Jews and Christians, an erroneous belief prevailed that divine favorites might expect divine interposition in their behalf. The Jews looked for it at their Messiah's coming. The Christians, not having experienced it, supposed that it was deferred until a second coming of their Master. Some Jews or Christians had, apparently, begun to lose patience, and irreverently to ask, "Where is his promised coming, for, since the fathers fell asleep, all things remain in the same condition as since the creation."[13] To meet this state of feeling the writer repeats and reiterates the statement that the coming would be quickly,[14] and, to emphasize this assertion, an angel, of such gigantic proportions that he stands with one foot on the land and the other on the sea, is represented as lifting his hand to heaven and taking an oath by the Supreme Being, and by the heaven, the earth, the sea, and everything in them, that when a trumpet — briefly delayed — should sound, there should no longer be any delay, but God's secret purpose should be accomplished according to the glad announcement which he had made to the prophets.[15]

---

[13] **2 Peter, 3**, 4.

[14] "I am coming quickly." — **2**, 16; **3**, 11; **22**, 7, 12, 20. "The time is near." — **22**, 10.

[15] Rev. **10**, 5–7. The passage imitates Daniel **12**, 7.

§ IV. *Phraseology and Illustrations.*

The phraseology of the book is largely borrowed from the Old Testament. Two passages are placed in the note as an example.[16] In some instances a recurrence to the Old Testament becomes requisite before the origin of a figure can be discerned. Thus, in Daniel **7**, 9, the Deity is styled the "Ancient of Days," and in accordance with this conception is represented as having hair perfectly white. The parallel passage, Rev. **1**, 14, uses the description for the Son of Man. Compare, in the Appendix, Note D, foot-note 8.

The habiliments of a heavenly personage are copied

---

[16] "Being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars; and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword; and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength. And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead, and he laid his right hand on me saying, Fear not." — **Rev. 1**, 12–17.

"There was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of the heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig-tree

"I said, behold a candlestick all of gold, . . . and his seven lamps thereon." — **Zech. 4**, 2.

"I saw . . . one like the Son of man." — **Dan. 7**, 13.

"Behold a certain man clothed in linen, . . . girded with fine gold of Uphaz." — **Dan. 10**, 5.

"The Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow and the hair of his head like the pure wool." — **Dan. 7**, 9.

"And his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in color to polished brass." — **Dan. 10**, 6.

"He made my mouth like a sharp sword." — **Is. 49**, 2.

"His voice was like a noise of many waters." — **Ezek. 43**, 2.

"And he said unto me, . . . Fear not, Daniel." — **Dan. 10**, 11, 12.

"There shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel . . . and the mountains shall be thrown down." — **Ezek. 38**, 19, 20.

"The earth shall quake before

apparently from those of the high-priest.[17] The period, more than once mentioned, of three years and a half, is based on a similar expression in Daniel.[18]

§ v. *Outline of the Book.*

John represents that he was in the isle of Patmos, because of his Christianity; meaning, apparently, either

---

casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken by a mighty wind. And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places." — **Rev. 6,** 12–14.

them [an army of locusts], the heaven shall tremble, the sun and moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining." — **Joel 2,** 10; cp. **3,** 15.

"The sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood." — **Joel 2,** 31.

"The stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light, the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine." — **Is. 13,** 10.

"The heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll, and all their host shall fall down as the leaf falleth from the vine and as a falling fig from the fig-tree." — **Is. 34,** 4.

[17] Compare Josephus, *Antiq.* **3,** 7, 4, with Daniel, **10,** 5, and Rev. **1,** 13. In later times the Catholics represented the Deity in the Pope's habiliments and tiara; see in *Iconographie Chretienne* by Didron, the *Histoire de Dieu*, p. 224, where a copy of the representation is given.

[18] The lunar year contained sometimes twelve and sometimes thirteen months. Allowing in Daniel's time, by a moderate inaccuracy, thirty days to a month, there would in three and a half years be either 1,260 or 1,290 days, accordingly as an intercalary month was or was not included in the reckoning. Forty-two months, or one time, two times, and half a time, or three days and a half, seem to be different expressions for three years and a half. Compare Rev. **11,** 2, 3, 9, 11; **12,** 6, 14; **13,** 5; and Daniel **7,** 25; **12,** 7, 11. The time during which, under Antiochus Epiphanes, the temple sacrifice was intermitted, was regarded as three and a half years; see Daniel **12,** 11.

that he had been banished or had fled thither. Spiritually he found himself in the "Day of the Lord."[19] The tenor of the book requires us to understand by this the day of the Lord's coming.[20] A voice behind him, powerful as a trumpet, directs him to write certain admonitions to the seven churches. Turning, he sees Jesus, who specifies what he should write to each. These specifications (cc. **2**, **3**) afford ground for probable conjecture on some historical points.[21]

---

[19] **Rev. 1**, 10.

[20] Origen uses the same term in the sense above given. He says: "The whole house of Israel shall be raised in the great κυριακῇ, Day of the Lord, death having been conquered." — **Origen**, *in Joan.* **10**, 20; *Opp.* **4**, p. 197, B, edit. de la Rue; **1**, p. 345, edit. Lommatzsch.

[21] Laodicea is told (Rev. **3**, 14–18) that she thinks herself rich, but is in reality poor. Tacitus says (*An.* **14**, 27), that Laodicea, when thrown down by an earthquake in the year 60, regained its position without Roman aid, by its own resources. Paul speaks (Coloss. **2**, 1) of Laodicea as one of the places where he had not been. Wealthy and conservative Judaism may have rendered it an unpromising field for him, and may, when the Apocalypse was written, have seemed to its author lukewarm or worldly. With him TRUE Judaism and Christianity were synonymous.

Near Laodicea, on the same stream, was Hierapolis, where Philip in the year 52 had been martyred by Jews and heathens conjointly. So far as Paul's journeys are recorded, it also had not been visited by him. It is not enumerated among the seven [chief?] churches by the author of the Apocalypse, and although there were some Christians there (Coloss. **4**, 13) when Paul wrote, between A. D. 62 and 64, to the Colossians, yet the field had not probably been a fruitful one.

The Nicolaitans at Ephesus — named, possibly, after some prominent member — may have been the society of Gentiles, with an admixture of liberal Jews, which Paul founded there (Acts **19**, 9, 10). They had probably discarded the Sabbath (see p. 240), and from **Paul's** remark to Timothy (**2 Tim. 1**, 15), cited on pp. 257, 258 (compare Acts **21**, 27), — a remark written after a renewed effort at Ephesus (1 Tim. **1**, 3; **3**, 14), — it is probable enough that his society shared the disfavor into which he had himself fallen. Whether they fraternized in a culpable manner with the heathens, or whether they merely appeared culpable in the eyes of their Jewish brethren, may be a question. The Christians at Pergamus are represented as dwelling in the seat of Satan, that is, of heathenism, and

After the admonitions, John represents himself as summoned to heaven (ch. **4**), and that he spiritually went there.[22] At the right hand of the Supreme Being was a book (ch. **5**), the book, as it would seem, of the Divine purposes. No one in heaven, nor on the earth, nor under the earth, save Jesus, proved worthy to open this book.[23]

By a book we must understand as in ancient times a scroll. This one would seem already full, for it is written not only on the inner side, as usual, but also on the outer. It is a sealed book until Jesus opens it. Jewish partiality for the number seven appears in the list of seals which fasten it. In chapter **6**, seal after seal is broken, and with each consecutive seal an additional portion of the book is unfolded, giving further insight into God's purposes. The breaking of the first four seals brings to view a white horse, emblematic of triumph to the Son of Man; a red, a black, and a pale horse, emblematic of war, famine, and

---

some of them as eating idol sacrifices. In this respect they are said to resemble the Nicolaitans (Rev. **2**, 13–15). Probably if a Christian had seated himself at the table of his yet heathen brother, sister, or friend, knowing that idol meat stood thereon, he would have been blamed. Paul's directions for a similar state of things (1 Cor. **8**, 4–13; **10**, 19–32) imply narrowness on one side and thoughtless, or else unconscientious, laxity on the other. The excitement of the years 64–70 was likely to reproduce or exaggerate either tendency.

The Christians at Smyrna seem to have been poor (Rev. **2**, 9), and the non-Christian Jews of that place were probably on good terms with, or else sought the favor of, heathens, for they are said to belong to "Satan's synagogue."

The allusion to but a single martyr (Rev. **2**, 13) in the seven churches renders it probable that estrangement and embitterment had not in Asia Minor produced much bloodshed.

[22] The surroundings and attendance on the Supreme Being, as described in ch. **4**, are borrowed from Ezekiel **1**, 5–24; Isaiah **6**, 2, 3; Exodus **28**, 17–20. The attendant creatures are so provided with eyes in every direction — and in Ezekiel with wheels — that they need not even turn around before starting on their errands; see Ezekiel **1**, 12.

[23] Jesus is designated by two opposite figures, as "the lamb that was slaughtered" (**5**, 6) and as "the lion of the tribe of Judah" (**5**, 5).

pestilence, or destruction generally, for his enemies.[24] The fifth seal displays the martyrs clamorous for vengeance, who are told to wait yet a little. The sixth unfolds convulsions of nature before which mortals hide themselves in terror, and when — after security provided (ch. **7**) for the Jewish saints[25] — the seventh seal is opened (ch. **8**) the inhabitants of heaven stand silent, awe-struck apparently, for half an hour.

After this, either as a means of carrying out the unexpressed horrors unveiled by breaking the seventh seal, or else independently of it, seven angels consecutively blow a trumpet. The plagues which follow these blasts are borrowed from the Old Testament, being mainly, though not wholly, those recorded as inflicted on the Egyptians.[26] There is, however, a noteworthy difference

---

[24] The emblematic import of each horse is sufficiently explained in the context of its appearance. The price of grain during the famine (ch. **6**, 6) is copied from 2 Kings **7**, 1, but with a seeming inadvertence. The Book of Kings represents Elisha as predicting to the beleaguered and famished city, where a woman had even eaten her child, the plenty which actually came when the invaders fled from their well-filled camp. The direction that no injury be done to wine or oil may have been owing to the prominent use of these articles, at least by the poorer classes, in temple offerings.

[25] Those who are guarded by a seal against harm are twelve thousand from each of the twelve original tribes of Israel.

[26] The hail and fire (that is, lightning) in ch. **8**, 7; **16**, 21, is borrowed from Exodus **9**, 23. The changing of the sea into blood, ch. **8**, 8; **16**, 3, 4, is taken from Exodus **7**, 20, 21. The darkening of sun, moon, and stars, ch. **8**, 12; **16**, 10, is based on Exodus **10**, 22. The bitter waters, ch. **8**, 11, are suggested by Exodus **15**, 23–36. The account of locusts, ch. **9**, 3–12, though having a basis in Exodus **10**, 12–15, is filled out apparently from Joel, ch. **2**. The ulcers, ch. **16**, 2, are taken from Exodus **9**, 10, 11.

In ch. **9**, 14–17, armies, of Parthians doubtless and Medes, are let loose at the Euphrates, to scourge the persecuting Jews; and in ch. **16**, 12, where heathen opposition is dealt with, an angel dries up the river so as to facilitate a passage for these "kings from the East." They had proved so troublesome as to suggest themselves readily as a scourge either for the Jews of Syria and Asia Minor, or for the Romans who had been unable to conquer them.

between their reproduction in this, and in the latter, portion of the book. Here the author is dealing with Jewish opposition. All the plagues fall, therefore, in a mitigated form. Only a third of the sun, moon, and stars is darkened, only a third of the sea becomes blood, only a third of the grass and trees are destroyed, and only a third of the springs become bitter. When we come to the overthrow of heathen opposition, we shall find that heathens get the plagues without mitigation. It is the sea, not merely a third of it, which is changed into blood, and so with the remaining inflictions. In the present portion a tenth merely of Jerusalem falls down (ch. **11,** 13), and the rest is converted. But in dealing with heathenism an angel casts a millstone into the sea (ch. **18,** 21), exclaiming, Babylon (the title given by the book to Rome) shall go down like that, and the sound of a harper shall not be heard in her again.

Before concluding the suppression of Jewish opposition and prior to the seventh trumpet, John takes from the angel, who has just asseverated the absence of any further delay, a small book, an account perhaps of what was about to transpire. By direction he eats it, and finds, as the angel had foretold to him, that, though sweet to the taste, it was bitter of digestion.

The suppression of Jewish opposition being effected, the writer proceeds, in chapter **12,** to that of heathenism.

The true people of God, that is, the faithful portion of the Jewish nation, is represented, according to a figure borrowed from the Old Testament, as a woman.[27] She gives birth to the Messiah. Heathenism, identified with Satan, is represented as a serpent eager to devour the child. The latter is caught up to God, and the woman seeks refuge in the wilderness. The serpent pours after

---

[27] In Isaiah, **50,** 1, the former Jewish people is represented as the wife of Jehovah whom he had dismissed because of her transgressions. In Ezekiel, ch. **16,** God is further represented as having brought her up from infancy and married her. The details of the figure there given imply utter coarseness and grossness in any community to whom they can have been addressed.

her floods of water, a common Jewish figure for afflictions, which the earth in her behalf drinks up.

The serpent in his rage makes war against the remainder of her children. His chief agent in this is a beast (ch. **13**), the Roman power. The rising of the beast from the sea, and some of the language concerning it, is borrowed from Daniel.[28] This first-portrayed beast (ch. **13**, 1 – 10) is the Roman power. One of its heads, Nero, is represented as slaughtered, but the deadly wound is healed.[29] It came into Asia from across the sea. A second beast appears rising from the land (ch. **13**, 11); that is, originating among themselves. It is portrayed as a subordinate agent of Rome's power, and probably represents Gentile Christianity, by which must be understood not merely Paul's teaching, but that of others with whom he might have had but limited or no sympathy.[29a] To an ultra-Jewish Christian this Gentile Christianity seemed but another form of heathenism.[30] Its inculcation of obedience to Rome (ch. **13**, 12) did not, in a season of war, diminish the odium against it. Some Gentile Christians may have vaunted, rather than appreciated, Paul's miracles (Acts **19**, 11 – 17), and the writer represents that this second beast "deceives the inhabitants of the land through the

---

[28] Daniel **7**, 2 – 27.

[29] See Appendix, Note F. [29a] Cp. note 209 of Ch. VIII.

[30] "This second beast had the horns of a lamb and the talk of a serpent"; that is, it put on the guise of monotheism, but its teaching was heathenish. It reappears (ch. **16**, 13; **19**, 20; **20**, 10) as the false prophet, or teacher. This view of Gentile Christianity by the writer should be compared with two paragraphs of Ch. VIII. on pp. 254, 255.

The second beast is by some leading commentators deemed an emblem of Rome's superstition. But Rome's superstition did not originate in Asia. Its professions, or outer appearance, would, in the eyes of a Jewish Christian, have been the opposite of lamb-like or innocent. To it he would not have applied in any sense the term "prophet," since there was no such thing as public teaching, or teachers, in the name of the heathen religion; nor in that age do Jews, or Christians, seem to have applied the term, save to a professed teacher of monotheism. Miracles, moreover, were not performed in the name of the heathen religion.

miracles which it is permitted to perform in the presence of the [first] beast," that is, in the presence of heathenism. The chief beast is designated by a number, of which a probable explanation is one of those given in the note.[31]

A subsequent passage, where this beast is mentioned conjointly with the woman in purple and scarlet, or the city of Rome,[32] leaves no doubt that it designates the Latin power.[33]

---

[31] The shorter of the annexed explanations is mentioned already in the second century by Irenæus, *Cont. Hæres.* **5**, 30, 5. The longer of the two originally appeared, so far as I know, in the Westminster Review for October, 1861, Vol. **76**, p. 261, Am. edit.

The shorter means "Latin"; the longer means "The Latin kingdom." The numbers affixed to each letter are those for which they are commonly used in Greek enumeration.

It will be noticed that in the longer explanation the word "Latin" is spelled without an ε.

The statement that the number is [also ?] the number of a man may imply that the name of some offensive Roman official in the province footed up 666.

Λ	30	Ἡ	8
α	1		
τ	300	β	2
ε	5	α	1
ι	10	σ	200
ν	50	ι	10
ο	70	λ	30
ς	200	ε	5
	666	ι′	10
		α	1
		Λ	30
		α	1
		τ	300
		ι	10
		ν	50
		η	8
			666

[32] The connection of ideas which prompted the presentation of Rome as an impure woman (ch. **17**, 1–5; **18**, 3) needs a word of explanation. The Jewish nation being deemed, as already mentioned, the wife of Jehovah, any deviation on its part into idolatry was treated as a wife's infidelity. Hence, idolatry was denominated impurity, and Rome, the support of idolatry, was depicted as mistress of impurities. Her clothing of purple and scarlet was probably suggested by the imperial costume.

[33] A detailed explanation is given in ch. **17**, 7–18. Verse 18 tells us that the woman — whose forehead bore, according to verse 5, a name of secret import, "Babylon" — is "that great city which hath rule over the kings of the earth." The seven heads of the beast are the seven hills on which she sits, and also the seven kings, one of whom is clearly enough depicted as Nero.

Fearful denunciations are uttered against any one who shall accept a mark of fidelity to the beast, however necessary to worldly advancement (ch. **14**, 9–11), and the punishments denounced are treated (verse 12) as cause for endurance on the part of the consecrated.

Aside from other calamities, which were to destroy Rome, the kings whom she had subjugated are represented in one passage as eager for her destruction,[34] though in another they are represented as weeping over her.[35]

In chapter **18**, an angel dilates upon the thoroughness of her destruction, dwells upon the causes of it, and therewith, in verse 6, calls upon God's true people to take vengeance upon her.

Chapter **19** opens with a song of praise in heaven to God, because he has destroyed Rome and avenged to the uttermost the blood of his BONDSMEN.

After the triumph over Rome comes the millennium. The beast and false prophet are thrown into a lake of fire.[36] Satan is bound for a thousand years.[37] The martyrs, alone apparently, are brought to life and reign with Christ during this period.[38] At the end of it Satan is loosed for a time, only to be again overcome, and this time he also is thrown into the lake of fire to keep company with the beast and false prophet.[39] The remainder of mankind are then brought to life and judged.[40] Then the New Jerusalem, which is to become the wife of the Lamb, makes her appearance, adorned as a bride for her husband, and a particular description is given of her attractions.[41]

The denunciations, with which the book closes, against

---

[34] Rev. **17**, 12, 16, 17.

[35] Ch. **18**, 9.

[36] Ch. **19**, 20.

[37] Ch. **20**, 2, 3.

[38] Ch. **20**, 4, 5.

[39] Ch. **20**, 10.

[40] Ch. **20**, 5, 13.

[41] Ch. **21**, 9–27; compare ch. **19**, 7–9. In one of these passages the time for the marriage is represented, before the millennium, as having come. In the other it is represented as taking place after the millennium. Nothing in the context implies that the writer noticed or attempted to solve the apparent discrepance.

any one who should add to, or take away from, its statements, were not so peculiar in that age as they seem now.[42]

The book, though often treated as a revelation made by Jesus, presents to the student, whether of opinions, or of Christianity, serious and painful contrasts to the Master's teaching in the Gospels. Those records represent Jesus as inculcating forgiveness to the uttermost, as weeping over the city which would soon put him to death, and as dying with a prayer of forgiveness for his murderers. The

---

[42] Among fragments of Irenæus is the following: "I adjure you, copyist of this book, by the Lord Jesus Christ and by that glorious coming of his, in which he shall come to judge the living and the dead, that you compare your copy and carefully correct it by this exemplar whence you transcribe; and that you likewise transcribe this adjuration and place it in your copy." — **Irenæus**, *Opp.* **1**, p. 821, edit. Stieren, or p. 339, edit. Massuet.

Eusebius adopts the above and prefixes it to his *Chronicon;* see Jerome's translation thereof in his Works, Vol. **8**, col. 9, 10, edit. Vallarsius. He also, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, **5**, 20, copies and commends it.

The following is from Rufinus, a writer at the close of the fourth century: "I, in the presence of God the Father, and of the Son and Spirit, invoke every one who shall transcribe or read these books, and I cite him by the belief of a future kingdom, by the sacrament (?) of resurrection from the dead, by that eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels; that, as he would not possess for an eternal inheritance that place where is screaming and gnashing of teeth and where their fire is not extinguished and their worm dieth not, he shall neither take away, nor insert, nor change, but shall compare with the exemplars, from which he wrote, and shall correct literally and shall separate [the words]; and that he shall not use an unamended manuscript nor one in which the words are not separated, lest difficulty of apprehension, if the manuscript be not separated [into words], should occasion greater obscurity to readers." — Prologue of **Rufinus** to the *De Principiis* of **Origen**, in Origen's works, Vol. **21**, pp. 13, 14, edit. Lommatzsch, or Vol. **1**, p. 46, edit. de la Rue.

The last caution was owing to the fact that many manuscripts were written without separation of words, so that they presented a mere mass of consecutive letters. Compare also, in Note D of the Appendix, the concluding extract from the Book of Enoch.

present work inculcates a spirit of revenge, not merely in a casual passage, but repeatedly,[43] and without its force being broken by a lesson of forgiveness or forbearance, however it may be palliated by Roman crime.

Jesus, according to the Gospels, foretold the overthrow of Jerusalem, but neither her subsequent splendor nor Rome's destruction. This book presents an opposite anticipation in each respect.

Jesus in the Gospels teaches a future when neither at Gerizim nor in Jerusalem should men worship.[44] This book represents the true worshippers as congregated in Jerusalem, while the vile and worthless dwell outside.[45]

CHAPTER X.

CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE, A. D. 70 – 138.

§ 1. *A. D.* 70 – 81. *The Reign of Vespasian a Coalition. That of Titus favors Reaction.*

THE reign of Vespasian was a coalition between himself as leader of the popular party and Mucianus as leader of the moderate patricians. Mucianus had been consul

---

[43] The enduring martyr is to rule the Gentiles with a rod of iron (ch. **2**, 26, 27); Jesus is represented as about to rule them in the same way (**12**, 5; **19**, 15); the torments of the damned are ground for endurance of the saints (**14**, 12); the destruction of heathens is such that for sixteen hundred furlongs, or two hundred miles, their blood rises to the bridles of the horses (**14**, 20); the people of God are urged to repay upon Rome her injuries towards them, and to requite her twice twofold (**18**, 6), and are in the next verse told to punish her for her self-complacency. Even the heavens, the apostles, and the prophets are called upon to rejoice over her punishment.

[44] Gospel of John **4**, 21.

[45] Rev. **22**, 3, 4, 15.

in A. D. 52. He and the moderate patricians cannot have sympathized with the high-handed course of their associates, and his voluntary exile was doubtless the result of non-assent to ultra-patricianism.[1]

He and Vespasian had, by political position, been at variance. They, however, became reconciled, and united their forces. Titus, who seems to have been on good terms with patricians and to have been partly under their influence, was the envoy, if not the originator, of reconciliation between his father and Mucianus.[2]

What the terms of agreement may have been, we do not know; but all such agreements imply concession by one or both parties, and the reign of Vespasian contained one or two acts which must by his own followers have been deemed a surrender of popular to patrician ideas.[3] A question may be how far this was due to Mucianus and how far to the semi-patricianism of Titus, who is said to have acted as his father's colleague.[4] Any claim of his to a

---

[1] "Suspecting the displeasure of Claudius, he [Mucianus] retired into Asia, and there lived in obscurity, as little removed from the condition of an exile, as he was afterwards from that of a sovereign." — **Tacitus,** *Hist.* **1,** 10, Bohn's trans.

[2] "Amongst the governors of provinces, Licinius Mucianus, dropping the grudge arising from a jealousy of which he had hitherto made no secret, promised to join him with the Syrian army." — **Suetonius,** *Vespas.* 6, Bohn's trans. "Vespasian in Judæa, and Mucianus in Syria, . . . beheld each other, for some time, with the jealousy of rivals. . . . Mutual friends made the first advances towards a reconciliation; afterwards Titus [??] formed the great bond of union between them." — **Tacitus,** *Hist.* **2,** 5, Bohn's trans.

[3] The expulsion of Stoics, probably in A. D. 71, mentioned in Ch. III. note 45, is attributed by its narrator to Mucianus. The death of Helvidius Priscus (Sueton. *Vespas.* 15) must have been conceded by, rather than acceptable to, Vespasian, though Helvidius was (Dio Cass. **66,** 12), equally as his father-in-law, Thrasea Pætus, an incarnation of patricianism. The patrician wing of the coalition, constantly in collision with him in the Senate, may have been anxious to get rid of him.

[4] "From that time [when he arrived in Italy] he constantly acted as colleague with his father, and, indeed, as regent of the empire." — **Sueton.** *Titus,* 6, Bohn's trans.

share of authority, as against his father, was sure to be magnified by reactionaries who had previously, for their own selfish purposes, counselled him to revolt against his parent.[5] He and Berenice, sister of the younger Herod Agrippa, had become mutually attached. His reluctant dismissal of her may have been due either to fear in the patrician wing of the coalition, lest association with Judaism might afford a handle to its enemies, or else to an influence of outside patricians upon Titus. The eloquence of Quintilian, in an assembly over which Berenice presided, had proved insufficient to remove political obstacles.[6] The beating of one Stoic (or Cynic) and decapitation of another may have found Titus in a mood to sympathize with it.[7]

---

[5] "The soldiers . . . saluted him by the title of Emperor; and upon his quitting the province soon afterwards, would needs have detained him, earnestly begging him, and that not without threats, 'either to stay, or take them all with him.' This occurrence gave rise to the suspicion of his being engaged in a design to rebel against his father, and claim for himself the GOVERNMENT OF THE EAST; and the suspicion increased, when, on his way to Alexandria, he wore a diadem at the consecration of the ox Apis at Memphis. . . . Making, therefore, what haste he could into Italy. . . . Presenting himself unexpectedly to his father, he said, . . . 'I am come, father, I am come.'" — **Sueton.** *Titus*, 5, Bohn's trans. He had in fact (Oros. **7**, 9, cited in *Indirect Testimony*, p. 79) permitted himself to be proclaimed emperor against his father, prompted probably by patrician officers.

[6] "Some have been judges in their own cases. For I find in the books of 'OBSERVATIONS,' issued by Septimius, that Cicero was present [as advocate] in such a cause, and I plead the cause of Queen Berenice before herself." — **Quintilian, 4**, 1, 18, 19.

"*Berenicen statim ab urbe dimisit invitus invitam.* He IMMEDIATELY, with mutual reluctance, dismissed Berenice from the city." — **Sueton.** *Titus*, 7. This must mean after the last effort to conciliate public opinion had proved abortive. Suetonius had previously mentioned the common report that he had promised to marry her. Berenice, according to **Dio Cass. 66**, 15, "dwelt in the palace, . . . expected to marry him [Titus], and conducted herself as already his wife, insomuch that he, having discovered the dissatisfaction of the Romans at these things, sent her away."

[7] After expulsion of the Stoics some of the more dogged and cynical

In the outset of the present period the omission of a custom has been deemed worthy of record by Dio Cassius, and this omission bears indirect testimony to the spread of Judaism. It was customary at Rome, if a general conquered Britain, or Germany, or Parthia, or some other country, to call him the British, the German, the Parthian, or by the name of the conquered country, whatever that might be. But, though Vespasian and Titus had won their laurels in Judæa, neither was called *Judaicus*, the Jewish.[8] To have borne such a title would probably have conveyed the impression that they were converts to Judaism rather than its conquerors. Of no other country save Judæa would this have held true.

Vespasian's encouragement of learning[9] may have been due to his position as leader of the popular party, rather than to personal appreciation of its merits. If he kept a monthly fast, this may have been due to some monotheistic custom of his wife Cænis.[10] His avoidance of for-

among them had, to use Dio's expression, "somehow crept [back] into the city." Of these, "Diogenes first entered the theatre full of men, and venting many calumnies against them [Titus and Berenice] received a beating therefor. After him, Heras, expecting nothing worse, shouted out currishly many improprieties, and, because of it, had his head taken off." — **Dio Cass. 66**, 15. If the analogy between Jewish and Stoic views were one of the causes why these men had been expelled, they probably found fault with toleration of Judaism in the palace, whilst they had been punished for sharing some of its views.

[8] "Both took the title of emperor, but neither received the title of Jewish." — **Dio Cass. 66**, 7.

[9] "He was a great encourager of learning and the liberal arts. He first granted to the Latin and Greek professors of rhetoric the yearly stipend of a hundred thousand sesterces each, out of the exchequer. He also bought the freedom of superior poets and artists, and gave a noble gratuity to the restorer of the Coan of Venus, and to another artist who repaired the Colossus. Some one offering to convey some immense columns into the Capitol, at a small expense, by a mechanical contrivance, he rewarded him very handsomely for his invention, but would not accept his service, saying, 'Suffer me to find maintenance for the poor people.'" — **Sueton.** *Vespas.* 18, Bohn's trans.

[10] "He enjoyed a good state of health, though he used no other means

eign war agreed with popular rather than with patrician ideas.[11] The addition or substitution of new members in the Senate[12] must have been grateful to both wings of the coalition. The new members cannot have been radicals, and were not long in adopting some peculiarities of the privileged class.

When the death of Vespasian left Titus sole ruler, a reaction in favor of patricianism must soon have become strong. How far Titus sympathized with it and how far he merely yielded to it may be questions. He had in boyhood been in the family of Claudius,[13] possibly as a hostage, since the aristocracy might mistrust his father's popular tendencies. The influences which there surrounded him may have swayed his character, or thrown him into association with patricianism. In his reign we find a vast amphitheatre finished for the demoralizing public games. We also find murder of the common people, but impunity for senators.[14] The latter was due to himself, and the former must at least have received no vigorous repression at his hands.

An eruption of Vesuvius during his reign made even reactionaries believe that the world was coming to an end.[15] Subsequently to this eruption a large fire oc-

---

to preserve it than repeated friction, . . . besides fasting one day in every month." — **Sueton.** *Vespas.* 20, Bohn's trans. Cænis, his wife, was a freedwoman of Antonia, concerning whom see Appendix, Note G, footnote 56.

[11] Vespasian "gave no aid to the Parthians when engaged in some war and asking his alliance. He said that it was not proper for him to intermeddle with other people's business." — **Dio Cass. 66,** 15. Compare Ch. V. § 11.

[12] Tac. *An.* **3,** 55, quoted in Ch. V. note 47.

[13] Sueton. *Titus,* 2.

[14] "The divine Titus with his great mind made provision for our security and REVENGE, . . . on which account we [senators] made him a god." — **Pliny,** *Panegyr.* **35,** 4. Yet compare Sueton. *Titus,* 9 ; Dio Cass. **66,** 19, who may perhaps have considered execution of common people as not worth mention. The latter, however, says (*Ibid.*), that Titus "did not attend to charges of unbelief."

[15] "Many and enormous men, exceeding human stature, such as the

curred at Rome and also a pestilence.[16] One means adopted for checking the latter ignored modern sanitary regulations, and may have increased the pestilence by communicating to public places the odors of a slaughter-house.

§ II. *A. D.* 81–96. *Domitian. Expulsion of Monotheism.*

DOMITIAN, besides being an adept in some physical exercises,[17] was a man of more ability and scholarship than

---

giants are depicted, became visible, at one time on the mountain, at another in the circumjacent country, and in the cities, wandering about day and night on the earth and traversing the air. . . . Then there was much fire and frightful smoke, so that the whole air was darkened and the whole sun hidden as in an eclipse. Night took the place of day and darkness of light. Some thought the giants had risen again, for many figures of them were visible through the smoke, and, besides this, a sound of trumpets was heard. Others again thought that the world was being reduced to chaos, or destroyed by fire. . . . The quantity of ashes was such that part of it was carried to Africa, Syria, and Egypt. It entered Rome also and filled the air over it and darkened the sun. There was for many days there no little fear among men, since they did not know and could not conjecture what had happened. They thought that all things above and below had been upset, that the sun had been extinguished against the earth, and that the earth had gone up to heaven." — **Dio Cass. 66**, 22, 23. The younger Pliny, who was nearer the scene of convulsion, tells us that he believed himself and the rest of the world to be perishing together, *me cum omnibus, omnia mecum perire.* — Pliny, Jun., *Epist.* **6**, 20, 17.

[16] "There happened in his reign some dreadful accidents; an eruption of Mount Vesuvius, in Campania, and a fire in Rome, which continued during three days and three nights; besides a plague, such as was scarcely ever known before. . . . For the relief of the people during the plague, he employed, in the way of SACRIFICES and remedies, all means both divine and human." — **Suetonius**, *Titus*, 8, Bohn's trans. altered.

"The ashes [from Vesuvius] caused at the time no serious evil, but eventually brought upon them [the Romans] a dreadful pestilential disease. In the following year a superterrestrial fire ravaged a large part of Rome. . . . It consumed the Octavian buildings with the books [that is, public libraries], the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and the temples in that vicinity." — **Dio Cass. 66**, 23, 24.

[17] "Many persons have seen him often kill a hundred wild animals, of

either his father or brother. His anti-patrician tendencies may have inclined or compelled him to take no part in their administrations. When the government devolved on him, he gave up scholarly pursuits for his new duties, devoting himself to these latter with laborious attention and thoughtfulness.[18] His capacity for civil administration is attested by the condition of the provinces during his reign. At Rome he seems to have distinguished between prosecutions for misdeeds and those prompted by private jealousy or greediness, encouraging the former and discouraging the latter.[19] He executed the laws, even

various kinds, at his Alban retreat, and fix his arrows in their heads with such dexterity, that he could, in two shots, plant them like a pair of horns in each. He would sometimes direct his arrows against the hand of a boy standing at a distance, and expanded as a mark, with such precision, that they all passed between the boy's fingers without hurting him." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 19, Bohn's trans.

[18] "Care for the world has turned Germanicus Augustus [Domitian] aside from the studies which he had marked out." — **Quintilian, 10,** 1, 91. "In the beginning of his reign, he gave up the study of the liberal sciences. . . . He perused nothing but the Commentaries and Acts of Tiberius Cæsar, . . . though he could converse with elegance." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 20, Bohn's trans. Suetonius was no friend of Domitian. The following, therefore, cannot be attributed to partiality: "In the administration of justice he was diligent and assiduous; and frequently sat in the forum out of course, to cancel the judgments of the court of the One Hundred, which had been procured through favor or interest. . . . He set a mark of infamy upon judges who were convicted of taking bribes, as well as upon their assessors [judicial assistants]. He likewise instigated the tribunes of the people to prosecute a corrupt aedile for extortion, and to desire the Senate to appoint judges for his trial. He likewise took such effectual care in punishing magistrates of the city, and governors of provinces, guilty of malversation, that THEY NEVER WERE AT ANY TIME MORE MODERATE OR MORE JUST." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 8, Bohn's trans.

[19] Scandalous libels, published to defame persons of rank, of either sex, he suppressed, and inflicted upon their authors a mark of infamy. . . . He put a stop to FALSE prosecutions in the exchequer [prince's treasury], by severely punishing the prosecutors; and this saying of his was much taken notice of: 'That a prince who does not punish [such] prosecutors, encourages them.'" — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 9, Bohn's trans. altered.

"He exonerated all those who had been under prosecution from the

when they favored his political enemies,[20] and forbore to avail himself of them in some cases where they would have served his private interest.[21] He can have had no belief in heathen deities,[22] yet in a heathen community his selection of Minerva as a chief object of attention shows the literary direction which he wished to give others.[23] The same tendency is manifested by comparing his action with that of Titus. The latter had devoted the furniture

---

treasury for above five years before ; and would not suffer suits to be renewed, unless it was done within a year, and on condition that the prosecutor should be banished if he could not make good his cause. The secretaries of the quæstors having engaged in trade, according to custom, but contrary to the Clodian law, he pardoned them for what was past." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 9, Bohn's trans.

[20] "He occasionally cautioned the judges of the court of recovery to beware of being too ready to admit claims for freedom brought before them. . . . And to preserve pure and undefiled the reverence due to the gods, he ordered the soldiers to demolish a tomb, which one of his freedmen had erected for his son out of the stones designed for the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and to sink in the sea the bones and relics buried in it." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 8, Bohn's trans. "Such portions of land as had been left when it was divided amongst the veteran soldiers, he granted to the ancient possessors, as belonging to them by prescription." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 9, Bohn's trans. Domitian "gave up Claudius Pacatus, although a centurion, to his master, because he was proved to be a slave." — **Dio Cass. 67,** 13.

[21] "To all about him he was generous even to profusion, and recommended nothing more earnestly to them than to avoid doing anything mean. He would not accept the property left him by those who had children." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 9, Bohn's trans.

[22] He openly opposed sacrifices, and, according to Suetonius, "purposed an edict forbidding the sacrifice of oxen, being prompted thereto by the recollection of Virgil's line (*Georg.* **2,** 537), —

'Ere an impious race feasted on slaughtered bullocks.'"

Sueton. *Domit.* 9.

Contrast reactionary coin in note 124. Virgil copied probably from that part of the Erythræan verses (Append. Note A, § II.) marked B or C.

[23] Domitian "especially honored Minerva." — **Dio Cass. 67,** 1. Compare Sueton. *Domit.* 4. Minerva is said (Dio Cass. Sturz's edit. Vol. **6,** p. 574, note 2) to be found frequently on coins of Domitian.

of his palace to ornament the temples which he rebuilt; Domitian bent his energies to replace the libraries.[24]

The charge against him of licentiousness comes from those who murdered him, and is inconsistent with his known habits. His temperance at table, his mental laboriousness and habits of silent reflection contradict the supposition of social vices.[25]

Near the close of his reign the word "Lord" in addressing him is said to have been common. This admits easy explanation.[26] The term "God" may in some instances have been applied to him, and its use have been exaggerated by hostile statements. The most natural explanation is that patricians endeavored to override justice by quoting, as authority, decisions of the "god" Titus or the "god" Claudius. Domitian doubtless thought himself equal to any god of patrician manufacture,[27] and if

---

[24] "He took care to restore at a vast expense the libraries, which had been burnt down; collecting manuscripts from all parts, and sending scribes to Alexandria either to copy or correct them." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 20, Bohn's trans.

[25] His entertainments "were soon over, for he never prolonged them after sunset, and indulged in no revel after. For till bedtime he did nothing else but walk by himself in private." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 21, Bohn's trans. "In the beginning of his reign, he used to spend daily an hour by himself in private." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 3, Bohn's trans. The statement by Suetonius that he occupied himself during this hour "catching flies," is a mere absurdity.

[26] In Greek the word Κύριος equally as the word *Herr* in German, is an appellation for the Supreme Being, or for any personal acquaintance. In the latter language the address on nearly every letter begins with the same word wherewith the Being of beings is addressed in prayer. If Domitian had gathered around him any literary Greeks, they would be apt to use, and others might copy in Latin, their accustomed form of address.

[27] Domitian "thought himself the same as the gods [whom we had made ?]." — **Pliny,** *Jun. Panegyr.* **33,** 4. "A certain Juventius Celsus, who was among the first conspirators against him, . . . addressing him repeatedly as master and god, by which terms others already addressed him." — **Dio Cass. 67,** 13. "With equal arrogance, when he dictated the form of a letter to be used by his procurators, he began it thus: 'Our

popular politicians applied the term to him they probably did it in self-defence.

The public games during Domitian's reign must have endangered, if they did not destroy, life. They must also have been expensive, even to wastefulness. In this respect he cannot have been a disciple of Tiberius, nor have shared the views of monotheists. Neither can his conscience have led him to shun all appearance of assent to heathen belief. He may have been irritable, but his forbearance towards his enemies,[28] until about the last year of his reign, evinces that he seldom gave way to this tendency.

In A. D. 95, perhaps towards its close, Domitian came into collision with the aristocracy, who had plotted, if not openly attempted, rebellion. If we trust the accounts of patricians and their copyists, we should have to infer that at this identical moment Domitian aided his opponents by driving their enemies out of Rome, that is, by expelling monotheists,[29] Stoics, and other allies of the

---

Lord and God commands so and so.'"— **Sueton.** *Domit.* 13, Bohn's trans. Political misrepresentation was so incessant and unscrupulous, that the phraseology of any such letter should not be attributed without question to Domitian. Popular politicians may, when authority of the god Claudius, or Titus, was quoted, have met it by saying: OUR Lord and God commands as follows. It is obvious from the language and doings of both political parties that reverence for the heathen deities had no existence.

[28] The Senate repeatedly endeavored to obtain from Domitian (Dio Cass. **67**, 2) his consent to an enactment which should render any execution of a senator illegal, unless the Senate had agreed to it. This would have insured to their order a practical impunity. Domitian, on the other hand, shared, doubtless, a common opinion concerning the Senate (Pliny, Jun. **9**, 13), as dishonestly forbearing towards delinquents in its own ranks, but towards no one else, and pronounced the lot of princes a hard one (Sueton. *Domit.* 21), because, even if they discovered a conspiracy, no one would believe them concerning it until after they had been murdered. Tacitus tells us (*Agric.* 45) that Agricola died [August 23, A. D. 93] while his kindred and friends were yet safe; while Carus, the prosecutor, had as yet gained but one victory.

[29] "In the same year [A. D. 95] Domitian put to death, beside many others, the consul Flavius Clemens, though his relative, and though married to Flavia Domitilla, also his relative. A charge of atheism was

popular party. This statement is so improbable that, before considering its only admissible explanation, I shall give a surmise of my own. The surmise is based upon the three following considerations: The aristocracy who expelled the Jews and monotheists in the time of Tiberius charged their own deeds upon that emperor, — a course of conduct which, as regards other matters, they repeated in the case of Caligula. Secondly, Tertullian tells us that Domitian recalled the monotheists.[30] If so, the charge that he expelled them is probably a patrician falsehood. Thirdly, the statement of Dio Chrysostom, a non-patrician, then resident at Rome, attributes the death of Clemens, not to alleged rebellion against Domitian, but to his near relationship with him. This accords best with his murder by the aristocracy, not by Domitian.[31]

---

brought against both, under which charge many others were condemned who had strayed into Jewish customs. Some of these were executed, and others deprived of their property. But Domitilla was only banished to Pandateria." — **Dio Cass. 67**, 14. "His last [?] victim was Flavius Clemens, his cousin-german, a man below contempt for his want of energy, whose sons, then of very tender age, he had avowedly destined for his successors. . . . Nevertheless, he suddenly put him to death upon some very slight suspicion, almost before he was well out of his consulship." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 15, Bohn's trans.

[30] Tertullian, after mentioning Nero's persecution of the Christians, continues: "The same thing was attempted by Domitian, who as regards [the] cruelty [in his nature] was a portion of Nero; but, in so far as he was also human, he readily put an end to his undertaking; restoring those even whom he had banished." — **Tertull.** *Apol.* 5.

[31] The anti-patricianism of Dio is plain from his writings and from his friendship with Nerva. He speaks of the "most excellent Nerva," and calls him a "philanthropic emperor, who also loves me and was long ago my friend." — **Dio Chrysost.** *Orat.* **45**, 2; Vol. **2**, p. 202 (otherwise 513). This writer issued at Athens a discourse on the subject of his flight, which begins as follows: "When I had occasion to fly because of alleged friendship with a man, who was not a wrong-doer, and who was most nearly related to those (the Flavian family) who were then prosperous and at the head of the government, and who died on the very account, which to many, and to nearly all, made him seem fortunate, because [namely] of his belonging to their family and relationship, this being

I assume that Domitian was in Rome, August 23, A. D. 93, and surmise that his latest war did not begin before A. D. 94 or 95, during much of which latter year he must have been absent from Rome. I suppose that the senatorial party during his absence planned a rebellion, and by enforcing the Jewish tax in a most odious manner,[32] compelled Jews, with not a few of their converts, to leave Rome; further, that by a senatorial enactment they drove out monotheists, whether Christian or otherwise. I suppose that they murdered the consul Flavius Clemens, who was cousin of Domitian, and a monotheist or Christian.[33] The children of Clemens disappear from history at this date, and were murdered doubtless with their parent. I

---

charged against me as a fault that I was the man's friend and adviser. . . . I considered," etc. — **Dio Chrysost.** *Orat.* **13,** 1; Vol. **1,** p. 418, Leipsic edit. of 1798. In this same oration Dio mentions, what the reader will find in Note A of the Appendix, foot-note 130, the character of his — somewhat monotheistic — teaching to the Romans.

[32] "The [poll] tax on Jews was, to a greater extent than other taxes, exacted with the most unsparing severity (or bitterness, *acerbissime*). Persons were subjected to this who, with no profession of Judaism, lived after a Jewish manner, or who, by dissembling their [Jewish] descent, had avoided the tribute imposed on their race. I remember having been present, while yet a youth, when an old man of ninety years was inspected by a procurator in a crowded court, *consilio,* to discover whether he were circumcised." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 12.

[33] See Dio Chrysostom, quoted in note 31. A patrician writer who was in Rome during these troubles charges the death of Clemens upon Domitian. "That ferocious beast, . . . as if shut up in a cave, now lapped the blood of relatives, now issued forth to the destruction and slaughter of the most renowned citizens." — **Pliny,** *Jun. Panegyr.* **48,** 3. With this should be compared a passage by the same writer, which implies, apparently, that Clemens and Domitian were on good terms. "Imperial praises were celebrated at the same time in the Senate and in the theatre, by the actor and by the consul." — **Pliny,** *Jun. Panegyr.* **54,** 1. The term "consul," rather than "the consuls" or "one of the consuls," can scarcely have meant another than Clemens; the theatre had probably, since Caligula's time, been an organ of the popular party. Pliny assumes, apparently, that what it or the popular party praised ought to receive condemnation in the Senate.

suppose that Domitian, after returning from the war, punished the aristocracy, putting some of them to death and driving others into exile.[34] Independently of any action by himself, the relatives of those murdered by the Senate were likely enough to prosecute the murderers, and a large share of the convictions may have been due to them rather than directly to Domitian.

To accept the foregoing is to attribute falsehood, or very ambiguous language, to Pliny, Jun., an objection by no means insuperable.[35]

If we accept patrician accounts they admit but two plausible explanations: firstly, Domitian, who seems to have executed the laws rigidly, whether they favored himself or his opponents, may have executed laws against foreign rites, or Jewish observances, so as to foreclose ground of complaint to his patrician enemies, when he executed other laws against themselves; or, secondly, we may suppose that the occasional application to Domitian of the term "God" caused in some way trouble between him and the monotheists. Either of the two explanations is at best merely plausible, and would hardly account for the death of his cousin Clemens, to whom he must largely have intrusted matters when going to the war.

---

[34] "Neither did flight and havoc follow your SALUTATIONS [on arrival, O Trajan]." — **Pliny, Jun.**, *Panegyr.* **48**, 3. This seems to imply that Domitian's salutations on returning from the war were immediately followed by proceedings against the conspirators.

[35] Pliny's Panegyric was a political tract. Among its objects the following may be included: Misrepresentation of the popular party and monotheists, with some taunts of triumph over the former; laudation of patricianism, including its faults; flattery of Trajan, that he might be swayed towards patricianism. The *Panegyric* (**11**, 1) represents Tiberius as having deified Augustus, and (*Ibid.*) Domitian as having deified Titus. The former can scarcely be an error; it must be a falsehood. The latter (see note 14) is contradicted by himself. If he charged on Domitian patrician crimes committed against him, he but imitated the dealing of his intimate friend Tacitus with Tiberius. (See Appendix, Note G, foot-note 122.) Such falsehoods must have been dangerous to contradict if they could be uttered while witnesses of their falsity were alive; yet the same thing happened unquestionably in Caligula's time; see Note G, foot-note 114.

I suspect the expulsion of Stoics or philosophers to be a misnomer for the expulsion of some patrician conspirators, with or without one non-patrician Stoic.[36] In the former probably the proportion of patricianism to philosophy was as a hundred to one.[37] Plutarch, though he

---

[36] Epictetus was a freedman of Epaphroditus, whose case can be better understood after a few words concerning the latter. Epaphroditus had been *a libellis*, secretary, or librarian, or master of requests, for Nero, and subsequently for Domitian. (Sueton. *Nero*, 49; *Domit.* 14.) The conspirators had perhaps bought him over, for he was banished. Subsequently he was put to death, though whether by Domitian, or after that emperor's death by persons anxious to get rid of his testimony, may admit question. Epictetus, the freedman of Epaphroditus, if he had not previously quitted Rome, may, because of his connection with the latter, have left the city or been banished. His somewhat dogged character, and his admiration of Helvidius (Epictet. *Dissertat.* **1**, 2, 19–22; **4**, 1, 123; Higginson's translat. pp. 9, 10, 308), might easily cause suspicion, though I am unaware of any distinct statement that he was banished.

[37] "When Arulenus Rusticus published the praises of Pætus Thrasea, and Herennius Senecio those of Priscus Helvidius, it was construed into a capital crime; and the rage of tyranny was let loose not only against the authors, but against their writings; . . . crowning the deed by the expulsion of the professors of wisdom." — **Tacitus**, *Agric.* 2, Bohn's trans.

According to Dio Cassius, Domitian "put to death Rusticus Arulenus because [?] he philosophized, and because HE CALLED THRASEA A SACRED MAN; also Herennius Senecio, because [?] in a long life, subsequent to his quæstorship, he had offered himself for no office, and because HE WROTE THE LIFE OF HELVIDIUS PRISCUS. Not a few others were put to death on this same charge of philosophy [?], and all the others were again driven from Rome." — **Dio Cass. 67**, 13. The expression "again" may refer to the earlier expulsion under Vespasian, though the Chronicon of Eusebius, misled perhaps by it, mentions a prior expulsion under Domitian.

One of the expelled "philosophers" was Artemidorus. Pliny, then pretor, was on a visit to him at his suburban residence, when the order for expulsion reached him, and lent him money to pay debts, or a debt, contracted for the noblest objects, *ex pulcherrimis causis* [to aid conspiracy?], and this "when certain GREAT AND WEALTHY friends hesitated to do so." — **Pliny**, *Epist.* **3**, 11. This visit was at the date *quum essent philosophi ab urbe submoti*, "when [the?] philosophers were driven from

numbered Rusticus among his hearers, seems not to have been molested.

The subjoined passages of Tacitus and Pliny may aid in fixing the date and character of proceedings by Domitian or others against senators.[38] Elsewhere we can find the views and temper of the parties.[39] The popular

---

the city." — *Ibid.* On their number see note 38. Artemidorus was a son-in-law of the Musonius mentioned in Ch. III. notes 45 and 75.

The Helvidius Priscus mentioned above, and his father-in-law Thrasea Pætus, used on the birthdays of Brutus and Cassius (Juvenal, *Satire*, **5**, 33, 37) to crown their heads with wreaths whilst drinking their wine, and, when Vespasian came as emperor to Rome, Helvidius alone addressed him as a private individual. The widow of this Helvidius, named Fannia, was still alive, and, at her request, Herennius Senecio, a patrician, wrote her husband's life, for which she supplied materials. Whether the writings of Helvidius openly advocated assassination we are not told. They probably leaned unmistakably in that direction, for the Senate felt compelled to order their suppression. Fannia succeeded, however, in preserving copies of them, and carrying them with her into exile. See Pliny, *Epist.* **7**, 19.

[38] Pliny (*Epist.* **3**, 11), speaking of his visit to Artemidorus, says that at that date three of his personal friends, Senecio, Rusticus, and Helvidius, had been put to death ; four others, Mauricus, Gratilla, Arria, and Fannia, had been banished. From this it appears that no simultaneous banishment by Domitian took place, but that more or less time must have been devoted to examination of the individual cases.

Pliny's statement enables us to interpret moderately, or else as an effort at disguising patrician crime, the language of Tacitus : "Agricola did not behold the senate-house besieged, and the Senate enclosed by a circle of arms ; and in one havoc the massacre [by patrician conspirators ?] of so many consular men, the flight and banishment of so many honorable women. . . . SUBSEQUENTLY *mox* our own hands dragged Helvidius to prison ; ourselves were tortured with the spectacle of Mauricus and Rusticus, and sprinkled with the innocent blood of Senecio." — **Tacitus**, *Agric.* 45, Bohn's trans. altered. If the first massacre refers to the death, by patrician conspiracy, of Clemens and others connected with the popular party, then, but not otherwise, is it comprehensible that the only friends of Pliny should have been those subsequently put to death.

[39] **Pliny** affirms (*Panegyr.* **62**, 3) : Domitian "hated those whom we [senators] loved, and we [hated] those whom he loved." "Nothing was more grateful [when you, Trajan, became emperor], nothing more worthy

party had during Domitian's reign gained one victory for humanity.[40] If they were, as alleged by Suetonius, indifferent to his death, they had probably been disappointed in other matters.[41] The sacrifices to Domitian were prob-

---

of the age than what happened [that we] looked down at the prosecutors, their faces on the ground and their necks twisting. We recognized and enjoyed it." — **Pliny**, *Panegyr.* **34**, 3, 4. The punishment alluded to consisted in fastening a man's neck by a forked stake to the ground, and beating him in a state of nudity with a rod. In the next section is mentioned "a fleet of prosecutors committed to all the winds and compelled to spread its sails to the tempests." — **Pliny**, *Panegyr.* **35**, 1. This may mean that a large number of the popular party, instead of revenging their murdered or banished relatives and friends, were themselves compelled to fly. Unless it have this meaning, it is difficult to comprehend that one vessel should not have sufficed to carry all prosecutors.

On the assassination of Domitian "the Senate was so overjoyed that they met in all haste, and in a full assembly reviled his memory in the most bitter terms ; ordering ladders to be brought in, and his shields and images to be pulled down before their eyes, and dashed in pieces upon the floor of the senate-house ; passing at the same time a decree to obliterate his titles everywhere, and abolish all memory of him." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 23, Bohn's trans. "It was a delight to beat on the ground the proud countenances [of Domitian's statues], to strike them with iron, to rage against them with axes, . . . to perceive the lacerated members, the broken limbs, and lastly the savage and dreaded images cast down and melted in the flames." — **Pliny**, *Panegyr.* **52**, 4, 5. Compare note 27.

[40] Domitian forbade the making of eunuchs. See Sueton. *Domit.* 7.

[41] "The people showed little concern at his death, but the soldiers were roused by it to great indignation, and immediately endeavored to have him ranked among the gods. They were also ready to revenge his loss, if there had been any to take the lead. However, they soon after effected it, by resolutely demanding the punishment of all those who had been concerned in his assassination." — **Sueton.** *Domit.* 23, Bohn's trans.

This patrician testimony, as to popular indifference, should be heard with caution or distrust. Pliny's statement (*Panegyr.* **52**, 4), that the brazen images of Domitian remained after the gold and silver ones had been broken or melted, may imply that images erected by the common people were defended, while the aristocracy destroyed what they themselves had set up. If this were so, however, Pliny must have wished to conceal, rather than convey, the information.

ably, as in Caligula's case, those of frightened conspirators anxious for their own safety.[42] Proceedings against the Vestals will be hereafter mentioned.

§ III. *A. D.* 96–98. *Nerva.*

Nerva, who succeeded Domitian, was of the popular party, as his grandfather had been. He and Dio Chrysostom were personal friends.[43] One of his first acts was to recall monotheists.[44] Even if Domitian had already issued, as before mentioned, a similar order, the murder of that emperor might cause need for its repetition before monotheists could safely trust to it.[45]

Nerva's age and infirmities unfitted him to master the elements of violence and discord wherewith he had to contend, and he selected, voluntarily or otherwise, Trajan as his associate and successor.

§ IV. *Position of Things about the Close of the First Century.*

The present section is devoted to some subjects which cannot be satisfactorily grouped in a chronological narrative.

1. Of SENATORIAL FAMILIES known to us in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, not a name, I believe, reappears among senators under Trajan. If I am correct in this, the fact claims reflection. Sixty-one years only had elapsed between the deaths of Tiberius and Nerva. Yet in

---

[42] Pliny mentions the streets (*Panegyr.* **52**, 7) as blocked by victims. Streets were very narrow, and Pliny's language perhaps extravagant.

[43] See note 31.

[44] "Nerva dismissed those condemned for unbelief, and brought back such as had fled [because of this charge], and . . . did not permit any to be accused of unbelief or of Jewish life." — **Dio Cass. 68**, 1.

[45] A change which the aristocracy had effected by a murder, over which they were especially jubilant, might well create apprehension of some revulsion in favor of old ideas. Even the humane prohibition of Domitian against making eunuchs had to be re-enacted (Dio Cass. **68**, 2) by Nerva, — an evidence that with Domitian's death it was supposed to have become either inoperative or not likely to be executed.

that period, scarcely a lifetime, Rome's senatorial families had perished, largely no doubt by vice or violence, and been replaced by others no better than themselves. Even in our own country, where transition from public to private life is easy, some names known to political history a century ago are found in it to-day. In portions of Europe class privilege keeps the same names in public life for a much longer period.

2. The corruption of the JUDICIARY is in several ways manifest.[46] Patrician influence on courts must have been baneful. The wealth and political power of the aristocracy enabled them to pervert the administration of justice. Their willingness thus to misuse wealth and power is illustrated by the utter absence of shame wherewith the younger Pliny mentions having accepted pay for slaves hired to influence a court.[47]

3. If we now turn to a subject connected with the decay of heathenism, namely, the EXTINCTION OF ORACLES, we shall find heathens forced to a position respecting it, which could not but strengthen monotheists. In a dialogue left us by Lamprias,[48] a relative of Plutarch, one

---

[46] Compare notes 18, 19.

[47] "Yesterday, two of my slaves . . . were hired at three denarii to applaud. . . . At this price any quantity of seats are filled, a large crowd is gathered, infinite outbreaks of applause are effected at a signal from the leader. . . . You may know that the worst speaker will be most applauded." — **Pliny Jun.**, *Epist.* **2**, 14, §§ 6, 8. This was of course written when Pliny was somewhat disgusted with the court. Cp. note 105.

[48] This document, entitled "*De Oraculorum Defectu*," is usually or always quoted as Plutarch's, for no other reason, perhaps, than that it is published among his works. It claims, however, to be written by Lamprias, and there is no reason for doubting its claim. The writer (c. 8, Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, p. 628, edit. Reiske) makes a speaker address him as Lamprias, and states (c. 38, Plutarch, *Opp.* 7, p. 695, edit. Reiske) that when he had finished some remarks, a Demetrius, who was present, subjoined, "Lamprias gives us good counsel." A little further on (c. 38, Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, p. 697, edit. Reiske) he is addressed by the same speaker as Lamprias. Compare the recurrence twice of the name in c. 46, Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, pp. 711, 714.

Plutarch had a grandfather, a brother, and, according to Suidas, a son

speaker, Cleombrotus, takes ground that the oracles proceeded from perishable and evil beings, half-way between divine and human, called demons.[49] This was precisely the view of Jews and Christians. One of his hearers admits a willingness to receive the view in part, namely, that there exists an intermediate race of beings between gods and men, but hesitates to assume that they are evil. His remarks, with the answer of Cleombrotus, are appended below.[50]

---

named Lamprias. In determining which was author of the work, it deserves note that he speaks of himself (47, *Opp.* **7**, p. 715) as yet a young man, though not so young but that (38, *Opp.* **7**, p. 697) he had already discussed the same question in public. Further, one of the chief speakers in the present dialogue, as we are told at its commencement, is a native of Tarsus named Demetrius, a grammarian, on his return from a visit to Britain. Such a visit was not likely to be made, nor yet to be represented in a fiction as made, before the latter half of the first century, when Plutarch's brother or son might have been young, but when his grandfather must have been in extreme old age or dead. This date for the document is confirmed by facts mentioned at the close of footnote 51. The work, therefore, is probably by his brother or son. In Smith's *Dict. of Biog.* the article Lamprias understands the above passages, or some of them, as referring to Plutarch's grandfather, but on what ground it does not state.

[49] "They appear to me to solve more and greater difficulties, who discover the race of demons half-way between gods and men." — **De Defect. Orac.** 10; Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, p. 633. "As regards keeping feasts and sacrifices, and unlucky or ill-omened days in which meat is eaten raw and pulled to pieces, [or as regards] fastings and wailings, and often also FOUL LANGUAGE IN SECRET OBSERVANCES and other crazy behavior, agitation [of body], neck twisting and contortions, I should say that such propitiation and exhortation was not addressed to any god, but [intended] to ward off some evil demon." — **De Defect. Orac.** 14; Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, pp. 642, 643.

[50] "Heracleon remarked: It does not appear to me badly laid down that oracles are presided over, not by gods, who CANNOT appropriately BE CONCERNED with earthly matters, but by demons, servants of the gods. But that any one, taking almost by a stretch from the words of Empedocles, should attribute to these demons sins and bewilderments and divinely occasioned wanderings, and should represent them as perishable

In the immediately following portion of the dialogue, a narrative is introduced by Cleombrotus to support the position that demons are perishable.[51] The narrative must have had some currency at the time, or it would hardly have been adduced as evidence. Its chief interest is its additional testimony to a growing disbelief among all

---

and mortal like a man, is, in my opinion, somewhat bold and barbaric [that is, Jewish].

"Cleombrotus thereupon asked Philip who and whence the young man was, and having learned his name and city, replied: It did not escape ourselves, O Heracleon, that we were getting into [apparently] absurd teachings; but in dealing with grand subjects we cannot avoid laying down grand starting-points, if we are to attain tenable results [or, more literally, "probability in our opinions"]. You do not perceive that you withdraw what you concede. For you confess that there are demons; but by regarding them as neither wicked nor perishable, you no longer make them demons. For in what do they differ from the gods, if they have a nature [or substance, *οὐσίαν*] which is imperishable, and a character [or natural endowment, *ἀρετήν*] incapable of suffering or sin." — **De Defect. Orac.** 16; Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, pp. 648, 649.

[51] According to Cleombrotus, one of his fellow-citizens named Epitherses had a son named Æmilianus, a rhetorician, whom some of those present at the colloquy had heard. This Æmilianus narrated to Cleombrotus that while yet a young man he made a voyage to Italy; that when opposite the island or islands called Paxi, whilst nearly all the passengers were awake and some of them yet at table, a voice from the island called by name on Thamus. This was an Egyptian pilot, known to but few of the passengers. The voice asked him, that when arrived at Palodes, he should announce that the great Pan was dead. He did so, and a loud lamentation was immediately heard from, as seems implied in the narrative, invisible beings. The news reached Tiberius, who questioned Thamus and attached such credit to the story as to make thorough inquiry about Pan. The scholars, who surrounded Tiberius, regarded the deceased being as the son of Mercury and Penelope.

Philip, one of the speakers in the dialogue, knew other witnesses to the narrative who had heard it from Æmilianus when he was an old man. See c. 17, Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, pp. 650–652. It will be noticed as bearing on the date of this document that Æmilianus was a young man when Tiberius was emperor (A. D. 14–37), that he was an old man when he narrated these circumstances to persons from whom Philip had subsequently heard them.

classes in the divine nature of those beings whom heathens had once regarded as gods.

The question as to why these once-celebrated oracles had died out, was scarcely new. We find broached more than a century earlier, in Cicero's writings, the analogous one, why the oracle at Delphi was no longer able to predict *truly*, why its power was dying out. Cicero puts into his brother's mouth an answer suited to Stoic conceptions.[52] But the ground is nowhere, I think, taken in Cicero that the beings whom heathens worshipped were perishable and evil.

The explanation which Lamprias puts into the mouth of a Cynic, concerning the cessation of oracles,[53] illustrates the absence of moral influence in what the heathens called religion. He himself, after the way had been prepared by other speakers, takes Stoic ground concerning one supreme being.[54]

4. Another item connected with monotheistic progress was the extra effort needed to keep up a BELIEF IN OMENS.

---

[52] See pp. 157, 158.

[53] At the outset of the discussion a Cynic named **Didymus**, who was also called Planetiades, exclaims sarcastically, "You bring us a matter hard to be determined and calling for much inquiry. . . . I propose on the contrary that you puzzle over [the question] why [the god] did not long ago renounce [answering], or why Hercules, or some other god, did not steal away his tripod, heaped with shameful and godless (ἀθέων) questions, sometimes proposed by persons [unbelievers?] who wish to test his logical powers, at other times by persons [believers] persistently inquiring about treasures or inheritances or lawless marriages." — **De Defect. Orac.** 7; Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, pp. 626, 627.

[54] Lamprias refers to the Stoic interrogatories concerning one immortal deity called Foreknowledge or Fate, instead of many Jupiters or Joves, and then continues: "What necessity is there that many Jupiters should exist, even if there be several [successive?] worlds, and that there should not be over each a chief ruler and divine director of the whole, having both intelligence and reason, such as among us [Stoics] is called Lord of all things and Father? Or what shall prohibit all from being subordinate to the fate and foreknowledge of Jupiter, and that he should in part oversee and direct"? — **De Defect. Orac.** 29; Plutarch, *Opp.* **7**, pp. 678, 679. On the term "Father," see pp. 52, 53.

There would seem, to one unacquainted with ancient history, no reason why the Jews, or early Christians, should as a body have opposed attention to omens, or why conservative heathens should have upheld it. But, had omens been done away, nothing would have been left of the heathen religion. Monotheists attacked the study of omens, because it was an attention to evil beings, the enemies of God.[55] Heathen conservatives upheld this study because of its supposed connection with their own privileges. Nearly half a century before the Christian era, when the battle between the contending parties had made less progress, Cicero, though a conservative, could, during popular ascendency, ridicule attention to omens;[56] but, at the present period, we find Tacitus and Suetonius carefully incorporating a record of them into their works. Tacitus places them under the respective years in his Annals. Suetonius places them at the beginning and end of his biographies. A century later, Dio Cassius kept up the hopeless effort to make history subserve a belief in omens.

5. The PUBLIC GAMES had, since the days of Augustus, been chiefly fostered in times of aristocratic ascendency,[57]

---

[55] Compare pp. 37 – 40.

[56] "Among us, omens on the left are deemed favorable; among Greeks and barbarians, those on the right. . . . We established the left hand, they the right, because in most cases it had appeared to be [the] more auspicious. What a discord is this? What [a further discord that] they use [for divination] different birds, and different omens, that their [method of] observation is different, and their answers [based on the same events] are different." — **Cicero**, *De Divinat.* **2** (39), 82, 83. The OPEN utterance of this in the days of Trajan would probably have placed the speaker in antagonism to the aristocracy. At a still later day some heathens wished to burn his works; see Ch. V. note 64.

[57] Even before the time of Augustus it is probable that, with few exceptions, those heathens, who were most allied with monotheism, discouraged these games. Thus, when Cicero's brother succeeded to Flaccus in Asia Minor, he promptly put an end to any such exhibitions at the public expense, as we learn from Cicero's letter to him, quoted on p. 72, note 2. Cicero speaks of their cost. His brother may have been equally, or more, actuated by their immoral tendencies.

and seem to have become conformed to the tastes of the more reckless,[58] so that some, even of aristocratic tendencies, if their self-respect was not drowned by party bigotry, or silenced by dominant sentiment, manifested repugnance towards them.[59] Conservatives had created a partisan

[58] Augustus, though he had a degrading fondness (see Suetonius, *Augustus*, 45) for witnessing even the fisticuffs of street rowdies, yet (see Suetonius, *Augustus*, 44) forbade women to be present at exhibitions of "athletes," which, probably, included wrestling, boxing, and racing, while in gladiatorial fights he restricted them to distant benches of the theatre, apart from the men. The brutality of these spectacles had, in times of patrician dominance, become more fearful. According to Dio Cassius (**68**, 15), the games, after Trajan's victory over the Dacians, lasted one hundred and twenty-three days. Eleven thousand animals, wild and domestic, were killed in them, and ten thousand men were compelled to fight duels. We may fairly infer that most of these were killed, since, otherwise, five hundred of them would have been sufficient to keep up a continuous fight. Had these men, mostly no doubt captives, been murdered in cold blood when they surrendered, the inhumanity would have been sufficiently unusual to have shocked mankind. The method of their murder was even more inhuman than such a supposed massacre. But custom and party bigotry had destroyed moral vision, so that only exceptional individuals in the conservative party uttered their voice, or their whisper, on the subject. The statement of the **Apocalypse** (**18**, 24) concerning Rome, "In her was found the blood . . . of all who have been slaughtered on earth," seems but a strong figure; nor is it to be wondered at if many shared the feeling in another of its passages (**18**, 6), "Repay her as she repaid others; yes, give her twice twofold of her own doings." What, too, must have been the industrial state of a community which could absent itself from labor during one third of a year at these butcheries!

[59] The younger Pliny writes that he had been called by Trajan into a counsel for adjudicating on the following question: "Among the Viennese [inhabitants of Vienne near Lyons in France] a gymnastic contest was regularly celebrated at the expense of some one's bequest. Trebonius Rufinus, an excellent man, a friend of ours, took care during his duumvirate to do away and abolish it. His authority as a public officer to do this was denied. He plead his own cause not less skilfully than learnedly. A commendation of his action was, that he spoke deliberately and gravely in regard to his business, as if he were A ROMAN and A GOOD CITIZEN. When the opinions of each in rotation were asked,

feeling in favor of these brutalities, by which the better members of their own body were silenced. Nerva's prohibition of them may have pleased more than the monotheists and their friends.[60]

6. On the subject of SOCIAL GATHERINGS AND SUPPERS, the reader should weigh well the testimony of Pliny in Ch. II. note 25, and in the extract below,[61] concerning

---

Junius Mauricus, than whom nothing is more firm or truthful, said that 'the contest ought not to be restored to the Viennese.' He added, 'I wish that it could be done away at Rome.' . . . It was decided that the contest be done away, which had infected the morals of the Viennese as has ours of all mankind. For the vices of the Viennese are confined to themselves. Ours spread [in every direction] widely." — **Pliny, Jun.** *Epist.* **4**, 22. It is apparent that Rufinus must have been an independent man. Pliny's statement implies this, and suggests moreover the following considerations. Rufinus commends his cause by speaking as "a Roman" and "a good citizen." Did he skilfully ignore monotheistic reasoning or un-aristocratic leanings? He spoke "deliberately and gravely." Did monotheists and their allies, or did the excitable portion of them, substitute, too frequently, ill-considered denunciations for argument? Compare Paul's advice in Ch. VIII. note 159.

Pliny must have feared lest Mauricus should, because of his utterance, be regarded as untrue to the patricians, for he inserts in his letter a remark of opposite tendency made by him at Nerva's table, attributing to that emperor undue leniency towards enemies of the Senate. Pliny himself, as we shall find in the course of this section (see note 108), held, when external support was lacking, opposite views to what he has here expressed.

Tacitus speaks of the German WOMEN as "hedged in by chastity; corrupted by no seductive public games, by no provocatives at private entertainments." — *De Moribus German.* 19. He preferred, possibly, to give prominence to these rather than to monotheist women.

[60] See note 22, of Ch. V. If we compare a quotation (Ch. V. note 22) from Dio Cassius with the reasons which Cicero, in note 57, assigns for his brother's abolition of public games, and with Pliny's defence of his friend Mauricus in note 59, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that conservatives, who saw the injurious influences of these games, hesitated to advocate their abolition on exclusively moral grounds, lest they should be regarded as untrue to the state religion and to the senatorial party.

[61] Pliny has left us a letter "to his [friend] Genitor," the same, doubtless, whom he elsewhere addresses, or mentions, as "Julius Genitor,"

their character; and the testimony of Tacitus, just given in note 59, concerning their effects on women; and compare the same with Pliny's allegations in the first-mentioned note, concerning suppers of "Foreign Superstition." On the younger class of men, or on any who had not independence enough of character to revolt at what was debasing, these indecencies at entertainments must have been corrupting. Even some, who disapproved, would become familiar with, and hardened to them. Human history justifies the supposition, that opposition to the monotheists may have been among the supporting motives for so indefensible a custom. Plutarch wrote more than five hundred pages of Table Conversations, with the

---

and whom in Book **3**, *Epistle* 3, he recommends for the position of guardian and instructor as "a man of rectitude and gravity, somewhat unattractive, even, and austere, judged by prevailing license." The general import of a letter, received from Genitor, can be judged by the following from Pliny's answer: "I have received your letters in which you complain that a most magnificent supper was repulsive to you, because buffoons, [indecent] dancers, and fools were wandering among the tables. Will you relax somewhat of your frown? I truly have [at my table] nothing such. Yet I bear with those who have. Why do I not have it? Because, if something lascivious is introduced by a dancer, something obscene by a buffoon, or something foolish by a fool, it by no means delights me as unanticipated or joyous. I tell you not my judgment but my taste. And, on this account, how many do you think that there are, whom the very things, by which we are delighted and carried away, would offend, in some cases as silly, in others as extremely affected. . . . Let us grant, therefore, indulgence to the pleasures of others that we may obtain it for our own." — **Pliny, Jun. 9,** 17. No allegation is made that these improprieties offended Pliny's moral sense. On the contrary, he gives us to understand that his judgment did not condemn them. It was in his eyes a mere matter of taste, in which those who enjoyed it were entitled to their predilections.

Dio Chrysostom mentions the latter part of the feast: "When a conjurer enters, or a clown, or some other such person, . . . but conversation by which men are rendered prosperous and better and more temperate, and better fitted for civil duties, you do not often hear." — **Dio Chrysostom,** *Orat.* **32,** 4.

intention, apparently, of suggesting means for amending the evil.[62]

7. The defects of FASHIONABLE EDUCATION had probably not abated since their portrayal in the *De Oratoribus*.[63]

---

[62] Plutarch's "Table Conversations" are arranged in nine books, to accord, as he tells us in his Preface to Book **9**, with the number of the muses. Each book was intended to contain a "decade" of conversations, but he seems to have had five extra subjects which he put into the last book. The latter half of the fourth book is lost, except the headings of its subjects, which Kaltwasser, the German translator, gives — I know not from what source — on p. 279 of Vol. **5**. The following extract is from the Preface to Book **7**: "The [prevalent] frivolities over the wine-cup penetrate the silly multitude [even] to their emotions, and pervert them, so that it is no less desirable to select approved subjects of conversation than approved friends for one's feasts; [friends] who in thought and speech shall contravene Lacedemonian usage. For the Lacedemonians, when they receive a young man or a guest into the dining-hall, remark, showing him the folding doors, 'No discourse [here uttered] goes outside of this.' But from us [Plutarch is addressing a friend and companion at meals], who have jointly accustomed ourselves to use the same [class of] discourses, there is exit for all things to all men, because the subjects contain nothing intemperate, nor blasphemous, nor immoral, nor yet anything slavish. This can be determined from the examples whereof the present book contains the seventh decade." — **Plutarch**, *Symposiacon*, Preface to Book **7**. *Opp. Moral.* **8**, p. 786; Hutten's edit. **11**, pp. 281, 282.

[63] The **De Oratoribus** was written (c. 17) in A. D. 75, by one who had already reached middle life, for he mentions (c. 1), "those whom I heard, *juvenis admodum*, in early manhood." Tacitus, to whom it is sometimes erroneously attributed, was (Pliny, *Epist.* **7**, 20) of the same age as the younger Pliny, who must, in A. D. 75, have been but fourteen or fifteen years old. Pliny, *Epist.* **6**, 20.

"In the present age what is our practice? The infant is committed to a Greek chambermaid, and a slave or two, chosen for the purpose, generally the worst of the whole household train, and unfit for any office of trust. From the idle tales and gross absurdities of these people, the tender and uninstructed mind is suffered to receive its earliest impressions. Throughout the house not one servant cares what he says or does in the presence of his young master; and, indeed, how should it be otherwise? since the parents themselves are so far from training their young

8. If we now turn to the VESTAL VIRGINS, we find that all, or nearly all, of them must have belonged to aristocratic society.[64] A change like this since the days of Augustus and Tiberius[65] implies some powerful agency at work. This agency cannot have been an increased belief in the old religion. It may have been, and in all probability was, the spirit of opposition to monotheism,

---

families to virtue and modesty, that they set them the first examples of luxury and licentiousness. Thus our youth gradually acquire a confirmed habit of impudence [immodesty ?], and a total disregard of that reverence [respect ?] they owe both to themselves and to others. To say truth, it seems as if a fondness for horses, actors, and gladiators, the peculiar and distinguishing folly of this our city, was impressed upon them even in the womb; and when once a passion of this contemptible sort has seized and engaged the mind, what opening is there left for the noble arts? Who talks of anything else in our houses? If we enter the schools, what other subjects of conversation do we hear among the boys? The preceptors themselves choose no other topic more frequently to entertain their hearers; for it is not by establishing a strict discipline, or by giving proofs of their genius, that this order of men gain pupils, but by fawning and flattery. Not to mention how ill-instructed our youth are in the very elements of literature, sufficient pains are by no means taken in bringing them acquainted with the best authors, or in giving them a proper notion of history, together with a knowledge of men and things. The whole that seems to be considered in their education is, to find out a person for them called a rhetorician. I will presently give you some account of the introduction of this profession at Rome, and show you with what contempt it was received by our ancestors." — **De Oratoribus**, 29, Bohn's trans. The concluding remark betrays a conservative's respect for antiquity.

[64] Two of these virgins were named Ocellatæ (Sueton. *Domit.* 8), and must, doubtless, have been relatives of the Emperor Galba, whom the Senate favored for his position, because he was an embodiment of their views as contrasted with popular ideas. Another, named Junia, was a relative of the Fannia (Pliny, Jun. **7**, 19, 1) who was the wife of Helvidius Priscus. Licinianus, the paramour of another named Cornelia, was defended by Herennius Senecio, a leader among the senators (Pliny, Jun. **4**, 11, 12, 13). Cornelia, moreover, was chief Vestal, and would hardly have had for subordinates the members of patrician families, unless she equalled them, at least, in rank. The whole number of Vestals was but six, so that not less than two thirds were of patrician rank.

[65] Compare remarks on pages 176, 190.

prompting patricians, in spite of natural affection, to place their female relatives in an uncoveted, and morally dangerous position, as a means of maintaining "old customs." These "old customs" must, one would think, have given strong evidence of decline, if their defenders resorted to such measures for their support. In determining the moral danger and moral repulsiveness of Vestal duties, we must remember that the official position of these girls would have caused it to be noticed as a slight, had they habitually absented themselves from the public indecencies and brutalities of the circus, where special seats were provided for them. We must recollect, also, that their ten years' novitiate — apart from parental care — was expected to begin when they were not yet ten years old; though the impracticability of preventing the older members from dying must, one would think, have occasionally compelled less juvenile selections. Three were convicted of unchastity in the time of Domitian, two of whom confessed themselves guilty.

9. We will now consider some views, actions, or fortunes of Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Tacitus, and Pliny, four prominent individuals of this era.

Dio Chrysostom was born in the strongly monotheistic province of Bithynia, in Asia Minor. No one of his own time seems to have equalled him in earnest eloquence.[66] His writings bear evidence that he was not merely exercising his mental faculties, nor aiming at literary fame, but that his feelings were warmly enlisted in questions

[66] The article in Smith's Dictionary says: "All the extant orations of Dion are distinguished for their refined and elegant style; the author most successfully imitated the classic writers of Greece, . . . his ardent study of these models, combined with his own eminent talents, his fine and pleasing voice, and his skill in extempore speaking, raised him at once above all contemporary rhetoricians. His style is throughout clear and, generally speaking, free from artificial embellishment, though he is not always able to escape from the influence of the Asiatic school of rhetoric." — **Smith**, *Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **1**. p. 1031, col. 2. The same article quotes Niebuhr's opinion (p. 1032, col. 1), that he was the first writer after [the time of] Tiberius that greatly contributed towards the revival of Greek literature.

connected with human improvement.[67] A man of wealth and, at home certainly, of influence, the personal friend, moreover, of Nerva and Trajan, he strove, not for honors or privileges, but for the physical comfort and moral well-being of his fellows. Outside of avowed monotheists, no writer stood so close as he to monotheism. This is less noticeable in his occasional leaning to the idea of one Supreme Deity,[68] than in his willingness to contradict heathen, and earnestly defend monotheistic, views concerning the moral character necessary in a divine being.[69] He was the friend, apparently, of a prominent

---

[67] The article quoted in the foregoing note, says (p. 1031, col. 1) that Dio's chief object was "to apply the doctrines of philosophy to the purposes of practical life, and more especially to the administration of public affairs." It also quotes (p. 1032, col. 1) Niebuhr's statement: "He appears in all he wrote as a man of amiable character and free from the vanity of ordinary rhetoricians, though one perceives the silent consciousness of his powers. . . . Whenever he touches upon the actual state of things in which he lived, he shows his master mind." For "silent consciousness of his powers," in this statement of Niebuhr, I should substitute "deep conviction that he was speaking important truth."

[68] Dio, in one of his discourses, compares a city, perpetually ravaged by its rulers, and revolting against them, with one "ruled IN REALITY, [that is] in kindness and agreement, according to that law which the wisest and oldest governor and lawgiver, the director of the whole heaven and the ruler of all which exists, has ordained for mortals and immortals, he himself being guided (*οὕτως*) by the same law, and exhibiting an example of his own administration; of a prosperous and happy organization."—**Dio Chrysostom**, *Orat.* **36**, 12, pp. 446, 447; Reiske's edit. Vol. **2**, p. 89. The subdivisions exist in the Vienna edition.

[69] To deny that a divine nature could be irritable and peevish might seem, to most modern readers, harmless enough. But, if the gods were not irritable, there was no need of pacifying them with sacrifices, or of studying by various contrivances the fluctuations of their dispositions; in other words, the whole heathen religion was at an end. Dio Chrysostom asks and affirms: "As [in judging of] a man, yet rather [in judging of] a god, or the gods, *θεὸν, ἢ τοὺς θεούς*, if you deem them illustrious, do you deem them NOT just and sensible, with self-control, and possessing the other virtues, but unjust, unreasonable, and [in their desires] ungoverned? [You answer,] Not I.

"Therefore, also, as regards a demon [compare note 50], if you pro-

Christian,[70] and appealed in support of moral teachings to monotheistic writings.[71] In consequence of this, it probably was, that, during Pliny's persecution of the Christians, a mob attacked and, it would seem, burned Dio's house, and the narrow-minded partisanship of Pliny would have caused him a yet further annoyance, had not Trajan intervened.

The sources of the preceding information are two orations by Dio, a letter of Pliny, and a response from Trajan. Dio had been engaged in erecting some public buildings. Certain porticos or colonnades were made a subject of complaint.[72] His language concerning these complaints

---

nounce one to be illustrious, [do] you [not] manifestly pronounce it to be just, useful, and sensible? How otherwise [you say]? Or as regards one whom you deem low. [Do] you [not] decide it to be useless, unjust, and unreasonable? Of course. What then! Will not each man live according to [the character of] his [presiding] demon, whatever that may be? Will he live according to a different one? By no means. Therefore [do] you [not] expect a man who has an illustrious demon to live justly, sensibly, and temperately; since you confess his demon to be of this character? Assuredly. And him [who has obtained] a worthless demon [you expect to live] uselessly and foolishly, unreasonably and without self-restraint? These things follow obviously from what has been said.

"Now then, whatever man, having understanding, is just and temperate he is *εὐδαίμων*, prosperous, being united to an illustrious demon. Whoever is riotous, senseless, and a doer of all evil, we must necessarily affirm him to be *κακοδαίμονα*, ill-starred, yoked to and serving a low demon? Certainly." — **Dio Chrysostom, 23**, 3, 4, Vol. 2, pp. 277, 278; Reiske's edit. Vol. **1**, p. 515.

The term "demon," in the foregoing, seems to be used for a being intermediate between divine and human. Dio judged all beings by a moral standard.

[70] See in note 31 of this chapter, extract from Dio, *Orat.* **13**, 1.

[71] See in the Appendix, Note A, foot-note 130.

[72] This appears in *Oration* **47**, 5, and is alluded to, apparently, in *Oration* **46**, 3. The consecutive numbering of these two orations, the repetition of this same subject in each, the allusion in the former to an attack on his house, and in the latter to its destruction, imply that the orations are of about the same date. The latter of the two orations alludes to Nero's Golden Palace. This was burnt in A. D. 104. The conflagration

and concerning the attack on his house is not only free from bitterness, but marked in some passages by a good spirit which it would be difficult to match in heathen writers, or even in some Christian ones.[73] In judging

---

would temporarily excite public attention and render an allusion to the building more probable at that time than at any other. This same year, 104, or the preceding one, 103, is assigned by Smith (*Dict. of Biog.*, art. Trajan, Vol. **3**, p. 1167, col. 2; cp. p. 422, col. 1) for the commencement of an eighteen months, or two years' proconsulship of Pliny in Bithynia; and we know from his correspondence with Trajan, that Dio was then there, and had been engaged in public building, which was made a subject of complaint. Compare note 76.

[73] "Learn first, that stones and fire, which to you seem fearful, are not so in reality. Neither by such weapons are you powerful, but [on the contrary make yourselves] the weakest of men. . . . The strength of a city and of a people consists in other things, and firstly in thoughtfulness and the performance of justice. . . . Why . . . are you angry with ME . . . and bring stones and fire against us? . . . No one of my neighbors, whether rich or poor, — and I have many such neighbors, — ever charged, either justly or unjustly, that he had been robbed of anything, or exiled by me. . . .

"What is that which I am able and unwilling to do, to save you from want? Or why is it that — because of my building the colonnades at the warm springs and the workshops — you are so disposed against me? This it is, some say, in which the city has been injured by me. And what man did ever you, or any one else [previously], blame for building up his own ground and home? Is wheat dearer for [my doing] this? . . .

"I would not have warded you off [they had, temporarily, at least, given up the attack], but in this respect it will be safe for you to burn the house. It will be sufficient for me, taking my wife and child, to depart. And let no one suppose, that I have spoken thus from anger on my own account, rather than from fear on yours, lest you be reported as violent and lawless. For of what takes place in the [different] cities nothing escapes the rulers, I mean rulers GREATER THAN THOSE HERE." — **Dio Chrys.** *Oration* **46**, 1, 2, 3, 4, pp. 518–522; Reiske's edit. Vol. **2**, pp. 212–219.

The last remark may mean that Trajan would be less indifferent than Pliny to the wrong done.

In the next oration, addressed again to his townspeople, he continues: "What, therefore, do you wish? I swear to you by all the gods, that rather than vex you, or any of you, or to seem burdensome, I would not

whether his difficulties were purely local, or whether the strife between monotheism and heathenism had prompted or embittered them, two things seem deserving of consideration. Dio defends himself by the example of persons who were "well born" and "thorough Greeks,"[74] that is, who were conservative heathens.[75] He makes a specific head of the charge against him concerning sepulchres and images,[76] and Pliny lays stress on a constructive

---

choose for my own the possessions of King Darius or those of Crœsus, or my former home, which was, in a true sense, a golden one, and not merely in name, like that which they called Nero's. . . . Advise me, as I requested [touching the colonnades], since with a wish to please you in every way I am at a loss. For now, if I touch the undertaking, and exert myself for its completion, some say 'that I am lording it [over them], and undermining [or else ingulfing] the city and τὰ ἱερὰ πάντα, ALL SACRED THINGS, for it is manifest that I burnt the temple of Jupiter, and floated the images away from the mill, and that they are now lying in the most public part of the city.' If I do nothing, not wishing any one to grumble, nor [on my part] to quarrel with any one, you all cry out, 'Let the work be finished, or let that which has been done be pulled down,' as if casting it up to me in reproach. What, therefore, do you wish me to do? For I will do what you say." — **Dio Chrys.** *Orat.* **47**, 6, 8, pp. 526, 527, 528 ; edit. Reiske, Vol. **2**, pp. 227, 228, 231, 232. The foregoing allusion by Dio to his FORMER home gives probability to the surmise that it had been violently destroyed. It evidently no longer existed.

[74] "I wish you to counsel me whether I shall at my own expense tear down what has been done, and make everything as it was before. . . . or tell me what . . . [you wish]. For I should think, whilst seeing other cities zealous for such [structures], not only those in Asia, Syria, and Cilicia, but our next neighbors of Nicomedia, Nicæa, and Cæsarea, men WELL BORN and σφόδρα Ἕλληνας, intensely GREEK, inhabiting a much smaller city [less able, therefore, to bear the expense] and under separate governments, and if they differ about other things, yet of one mind about such [structures], and the emperor by good fortune enjoining such, because he wishes in every way that your city should be increased (permit me to read his epistle . . .), — I should think that you would have the same structures and that no one would be displeased at the city's adornment." — **Dio Chrys.** *Orat.* **47**, 5, p. 526, Reiske's edit. Vol. **2**, pp. 226, 227.

[75] See Ch. VII. note 26.

[76] "So far as concerns the sepulchres and the sacred structures, it will

lack of regard in Dio towards the heathen religion. This last charge needs a word of explanation. There was in the public building which Dio had erected a library, and in this library an image of Trajan. If Trajan were really "DIVINE," then it would, according to ancient ideas, be a pollution to the image of the god, that a dead body should be placed in proximity to it. But in a court, or lawn, near by, Dio's wife and child lay buried. The advocate who was employed to prosecute Dio for breach, or insufficient performance of contract in erecting the building, seems to have been ashamed of this additional charge. Yet Pliny — who had already more than once deferred settling these accounts, which Dio was anxious to close, and who had, at the request of Dio's opponents, moved their examination to another town — delayed the whole matter for the purpose of communicating to the emperor concerning his statue.[77] The emperor responded that

---

not be proper to omit, that, for the inhabitants of Antioch, it is not allowed [speaking by contraries?] to undertake anything of the kind, . . . whose city is thirty-six stadia [about four and a half miles] long, and they have made colonnades on either side. Nor yet the inhabitants of Tarsus or of Nicomedia, who voted to remove the sepulchres. And Macrinus, whom they [the Nicomedians] enrolled as a benefactor of the city, transferred out of the market-place the sepulchre of King Prusias and also his image. For among them there was [we may assume] no one who loved his city or CARED ABOUT THE GODS; but among us such were plentiful.

"But be the foregoing matters as they may, what need had I [specially] of a colonnade there, as if . . . I only was to promenade there and none of the other citizens?" — **Dio Chrys. 47**, 7; edit. Reiske, Vol. **2**, pp. 229, 230.

[77] "Whilst I was despatching some public affairs, sir, at Prusa, with an intention of leaving that city the same day, the magistrate Asclepiades informed me, that Eumolpus had appealed to me from a motion which Cocceianus Dion made in their Senate. Dion, it seems, having been appointed supervisor of a public edifice, desired that it might be assigned to the city in form. Eumolpus, who was counsel for Flavius Archippus, insisted that Dion should first be required to deliver in his accounts relating to this work, before it was assigned to the corporation; suggesting he had not performed his duty in the manner he ought. He took notice

Dio's accounts with the public were of course to be duly examined, but that the statue was a matter about which Pliny ought not to have written him.[78]

---

at the same time, that this building, in which your statue is erected, was made use of also for the burial of the dead, the bodies of Dion's wife and son being (as he asserted) there deposited; and petitioned that I would hear this cause in the public tribunal. Upon my complying with his request, and deferring my journey for that purpose, he desired a longer day in order to prepare the cause, and that I would try it in some other city. I appointed the city of Nicea, where, when I took my seat, Eumolpus, pretending not to be yet sufficiently instructed, moved that the trial might be again put off; Dion, on the contrary, insisted that it should be heard. They debated this point very fully on both sides, and entered a little into the merits of the cause; when, being of an opinion that it was reasonable [advisable] it should be adjourned, and thinking it proper to advise with you in an affair WHICH WAS OF CONSEQUENCE IN POINT OF EXAMPLE, I directed them to give in the articles of their respective allegations in writing; for I was desirous you should judge from their own words of what was offered on each part. This Dion promised to do, as Eumolpus also assured me he would draw up in writing what he had to allege on the part of the community. But he added, that, being only concerned as advocate on behalf of Archippus, whose instructions he had laid before me, HE HAD NOTHING TO CHARGE WITH RESPECT TO THE SEPULCHRES. Archippus, however, for whom Eumolpus was counsel here, at Prusa, undertook to present an accusation upon this head in writing. But neither Eumolpus nor Archippus (though I have waited several days for that purpose) have yet performed their engagement: Dion indeed has; and I have annexed his memorial to this letter. I have taken a view myself of the buildings, where I find your statue is placed in a library; and as to the edifice which is supposed to contain the bodies of Dion's wife and son, it stands in the middle of an area, which is surrounded with a colonnade. I particularly, therefore, entreat you, sir, to direct my judgment in the determination of this cause ABOVE ALL OTHERS, as it is a point to which THE WORLD IS GREATLY ATTENTIVE. And, indeed, it highly deserves a very mature deliberation, since the fact is not only ACKNOWLEDGED, but countenanced by MANY EXAMPLES." — **Pliny, Jun. 10,** 85, Melmoth's trans.

[78] "As you well know, my dear Pliny, it is the fixed maxim of my government not to create an awe of my person by severe and rigorous measures, and by construing every slight offence into an act of treason, there was no occasion for you to hesitate a moment upon the point,

The wife and child, interred near the public library, may have been the same whom Dio, in his *Oration*, **46**, 4 (quoted in note 73), mentions as alive. If so, the question suggests itself, whether a violent destruction of his home can have hastened his wife's death.

Pliny's behavior towards Dio is only to be accounted for, by supposing that personal or political feeling had impelled him into an unworthy and contemptible course. Under Trajan's rule and Pliny's proconsulship, zeal for heathenism was doubtless a passport to office, of which Dio's enemies availed themselves. But in Trajan this tendency was more modified by equity, or else by personal regard for Dio, than in Pliny. I am unaware of any instance in which Dio attempted to preserve, or improve, his own standing by disparagement of Jews or Christians. Unwillingness to seek favor or avoid persecution, in such a way, is no slight evidence of true-heartedness and self-respect.

The appeal from a decision of the city senate to Pliny implies that the former body favored Dio. The removal of the trial from Prusa — its appropriate place of hearing, and where any evidence would be most accessible — admits but one plausible solution. Public opinion there must have favored Dio. His opponents must have wished to withdraw the trial from any such influence. This implies, however, that the opposition to him, which appears in notes 72 and 73, must have been unsustained by public sentiment, or, at least, must have been short-lived. Perhaps it may have been instigated by the self-interest of a few.

---

concerning which you thought proper to consult me. Without entering, therefore, into that question (TO WHICH I WOULD BY NO MEANS GIVE ANY ATTENTION, THOUGH THERE WERE EVER SO MANY INSTANCES OF THE SAME KIND), I recommend to your care the examination of Dion's accounts relating to the public works which he has finished; as it is a case in which the interest of the city is concerned, and as Dion neither ought, nor indeed does refuse to submit to the inquiry." — **Trajan**, in *Pliny, Jun.* **10**, 86, Melmoth's trans.

An equally probable translation of what succeeds the parenthesis is the following: "Let an account of the whole work *effecti sub cura tua*, accomplished under your jurisdiction, be exacted from Cocceianus Dio."

The facility with which Pliny permitted himself to be diverted from a simple business matter, by alleged danger to religion, may aid our understanding of other events in his proconsulship, which we shall hereafter consider.

10. PLUTARCH, the next on our list, stood one remove further than Dio from monotheistic ground. The remove was a tolerably broad one, unless I am deceived as to the following remark. Dio's writings imply, at least, if they do not state, the binding force of conscience and the supremacy of moral law. In Plutarch, morality seems to be regarded rather from a utilitarian position, as a preservative against folly and suffering. In determining Plutarch's application of his own views, his "Consolation," addressed to his wife, shows an approval of simplicity in dress as practised by her.[79] His "Table Conversations" show that he aimed at something better than ordinary heathen customs. Yet he seems inclined to expose error rather than EARNESTLY to advocate moral truth. He was willing to ridicule the Jews[80] and to dwell on Stoic inconsistencies.[81] As the Stoics were the only body of heathens who AS A CLASS laid stress on morality, it arrests attention that a moralist should only find fault with them.

Plutarch's tract on Superstition opens to us his state of

---

[79] Plutarch, *Consolatio ad Uxorem*, 4; *Opp.* **8**, p. 402, edit. Reiske.

[80] The fourth book of Plutarch's Table Conversations is imperfect, breaking off apparently in the course of the fifth Conversation. The extant portion of this Conversation discusses the question why Jews abstain from pork; whether, because of disgust towards swine, or, on the other hand, because of a religious veneration for them. The extant fragment adopts the latter of the two suppositions. Whether in the lost portion of it any speaker was represented as defending the opposite view is but a matter of surmise. Unless the extant misrepresentation were palliated by something now lost, it is very inexcusable.

In the tract *On Superstition* (7, *Opp.* **6**, pp. 646, 647, edit. Reiske), Plutarch illustrates his subject by the conduct of Jews who had permitted, during war, that enemies should capture their fortifications without resistance on the sabbath. The illustration, though a fair one, would probably have been avoided had the writer regarded Jewish morality as calling, in the main, for more acceptance than it received.

[81] Plutarch devoted a special work to the *Inconsistencies of the Stoics.*

mind. In it superstitious heathens are deservedly and unsparingly held up to ridicule.[82] We can safely infer that the writer who does this belonged not to the class who were trembling for the fate of old institutions. On the other hand, we do not find him elucidating and defending any set of views which commanded his unqualified assent. He merely contrasts superstition with atheism, and between the two extremes gives a preference to the latter. He assumes, however, without argument, though not without contradiction from himself, the benevolent character of any divine being,[83] and, in so doing, places

---

[82] "Of all fears the most incurable and helpless is superstition. The sea is no terror to him who sails not, nor war to him who is not engaged in it. The stayer at home fears not highwaymen, nor does the poor man dread sycophants, nor the private individual fear the envious. The dweller in Gaul is not afraid of earthquakes, nor in Ethiopia of thunderbolts. But he who fears the gods, fears all things, — land, sea, air, heaven, darkness, light, sound, silence, dreams." — **Plutarch,** *De Superstitione*, 3. "There is a law for slaves who give up the idea of freedom, that they may ask a sale and change their master for a juster one. But superstition grants no change of gods, nor is it possible to find a god without terror for him who fears those of his country and family, who shudders at saviors and benefactors; trembling and afraid of those from whom we ask wealth, plenty, concord, peace, the direction of 'most prosperous words and works.'" — *De Superstit.* 4; *Opp.* **6**, p. 635. "An altar is a [safe] refuge for a slave. Even by robbers many fanes are [deemed] inviolable; and fugitives from enemies, if they can lay hold of an image or a temple, take courage. But the superstitious man shudders and fears before, and is alarmed by, the very things which give hope to others in their utmost dread. [No need] to drag a superstitious man from fanes. He suffers punishment and vengeance there. What need of many words? Death is to all [in the sense of, to most] men the close of life. But to the superstitious man not even it [is the end]. He transcends these limits, creating to himself a fear of existence beyond, longer than this life, and attaching to death the thought of endless evils." — *De Superstit.* 4; *Opp.* **6**, pp. 635, 636. "Others contend with misfortune, . . . but the superstitious man, saying to himself without prompting from any one, 'You suffer these things, O ill-starred man, through providence and the command of divine power,' throws away all hope." — *De Superstit.* 7; *Opp.* **6**, p. 644.

[83] "Atheism, being an incorrect decision, that nothing is blessed and

himself in striking contrast to conservatism as manifested in Tacitus. His allusion to divine power as paternal is best explained by supposing that Monotheism had even

---

imperishable, seems to cause absence of suffering by its lack of belief in anything divine; and the result of believing that no gods exist is that you do not fear them. [On the other hand] its name [in Greek, '*demon-dread*'] indicates superstition as a belief which causes suffering, and as the [prevalent] poetic conception of a fear which debases and crushes a man who believes that there are gods, and that these are mischievous and hurtful. . . . Ignorance has implanted in the one a disbelief of that which is benignant, but in the other has superadded an opinion that it harms [us]." — **Plutarch,** *De Superstit.* 2, *Opp.* **6,** pp. 629, 630. "What then! Does not the condition of atheists as compared with the superstitious appear to you as having this advantage? The former see no gods whatever; the latter believe their existence. The former pay them no attention; the latter conceive as frightful what is benignant, as tyrannical what is PATERNAL, as noxious what is protective; and what is ἀμίμητον, inimitable [in perfection] they deem violent and savage. Then they are persuaded by brass-founders and stone-cutters and wax-moulders, that the bodies of the gods are like those of men; and they form and dress up such things, and bow down before them." — *De Superstit.* 6; *Opp.* **6,** p. 639.

"Neither in the pleasures [of life] is [superstition] superior to atheism. Men take special pleasure in festivals, and sacred entertainments and initiations and orgies, and supplication of the gods and adorations. See then the atheist under such circumstances, laughing a mad and sardonic laughter at these proceedings, — and perhaps remarking quietly to his companions, that they are blinded and demented, who think that these things are a service of the gods, — but otherwise unblamable. The superstitious man [on the contrary] wishes, but is unable, to rejoice or take pleasure. The city is filled with sacrifices and pæans; the soul of the superstitious man with groans. Crowned with a wreath, he turns pale; sacrificing, he is in terror; he prays in a quivering voice, and offers incense with trembling hands." — *De Superstit.* 8; *Opp.* **6,** pp. 647, 648. "It is a matter of wonder to me that those who call atheism ἀσέβειαν unbelief, do not call superstition the same. I would prefer that men should say of me, that I had never existed, that there was no Plutarch, rather than to say, that Plutarch is an unreliable, fickle man, prompt to anger, revengeful about ordinary occurrences, taking offence at trifles." — *De Superstit.* 9; *Opp.* **6,** p. 648. "The atheist thinks that there are no gods. The superstitious man wishes that there were none. He believes unwillingly, for he fears death. . . . The atheist has no share in super-

in Europe influenced the less bigoted heathens.[84] It may be doubted, however, whether, in Plutarch's religious system, the ideas of responsibility to divine power and of quiet self-sacrifice held a prominent place. His tone would lead us to expect less of it in him than in Dio.

Plutarch designates a CLASS of heathens as atheists. I am unaware that this is done by any other heathen writer. In his time, or shortly afterwards, the term A-theists designated Christians. Was he indirectly defending Christians against maltreatment? He never ridicules them as he does Jews. His argument would favor Christians equally as other non-worshippers of the heathen deities. No class of HEATHEN atheists were so placed as to call for defence. Christians were. If his work on Superstition were written during Nerva's reign,[85] it could scarcely have been regarded by its readers otherwise than as making ground on which Christians could stand; as palliating their non-recognition of the heathen deities. His work "Against the Stoics" may have been written under Trajan.

Such degree of affinity between him and Christianity as the foregoing may imply is corroborated by Plutarch's position touching Homer. Concordance with the Erythræan verses as to Homer's falsehoods about the gods[86] had won for Dio the epithet of Unbeliever, or Monotheist.[87]

---

stition. But the superstitious man, who would prefer to be an atheist, is too weak to think as he would wish concerning the gods. The atheist, moreover, is not an accomplice of superstition, but superstition originated atheism and gives an apology, though not a correct nor praiseworthy one, for its existence." — *De Superstit.* 10, 11; *Opp.* **6**, pp. 652, 653.

[84] On the term, "Father Jupiter," in heathen writings, see remarks on page 52.

[85] The tract on Superstition is, according to the present arrangement of Plutarch's works, followed by one "Apophthegmata," addressed to the Emperor Trajan. If the present arrangement corresponds with the order in which the different works were written, additional plausibility would be given to the supposition that the one on Superstition appeared during Nerva's reign. Its publication, if during conservative supremacy, would seem somewhat bold.

[86] See Appendix, Note A, foot-note 62.

[87] See Appendix, Note A, foot-note 63.

Plutarch agrees with Dio and the monotheists, that gods did not join in the fight nor get beaten before Troy. He states: "The self-contradictions of the poets, by interfering with credence, do not permit a strong tendency towards the injurious. When juxtaposition renders their inconsistencies obvious, we must assent to what is most reasonable. . . . When absurdities are uttered, and not at once solved [in the sense of exposed], we must render them powerless by means of their opposites elsewhere stated, not being discontented, nor angry with the poet [himself], but [only] at statements made from habit or playfulness. Thus, if you please, [in answer] to the Homeric accounts of gods thrown headlong by each other, and their being wounded by men and their variances and hatreds [quote]: —

'You can devise a better tale than this,'[88]

and you do devise . . . and utter elsewhere the following, which is superior and better: —

'. . . the quietly living gods.'[89]

And

'There the blessed gods perpetually enjoy themselves.'[90]

And

'Thus the gods appoint for miserable mortals
To live afflicted. But they themselves have no care.'[91]

"For these are wholesome and true opinions, but the former are invented for the consternation of men."[92]

In this last quotation from Homer, the indifference of the gods towards human happiness is striking. Plutarch's approval of it strengthens the conviction that heathen conservatives — whatever their repugnance for his teachings — would fear him less than the more earnest Dio. His expressed approval of such intense selfishness is rendered yet more strange by his immediately subjoining, "When Euripides says,

'With many a form of sophism the gods,
Our superiors, mislead us,'

---

[88] **Iliad, 7,** 358. [89] **Iliad, 6,** 138. [90] **Odys. 6,** 46.

[91] **Iliad, 24,** 525, 526.

[92] **Plutarch,** *De audiendis Poetis,* 4; *Opp. Moral.* **6,** pp. 72, 73.

it is no mistake to add his better remark: —

'If the gods do anything wrong, THEY ARE NOT GODS.'"[93]

Heathens who, with or without interest in monotheism, contemned their national religion, and the bigotry or self-interest of its defenders, must have listened with relish to Plutarch's skilful subversion of conservative positions by means of conservative authorities.

11. TACITUS, in regard to what was called religion, shared the narrow bigotry and inconsistency, and joined in asserting the debasing views of the class to which he belonged. He tells us his uncertainty as to whether human affairs were or were not the result of chance.[94] Yet, in the face of this, he alleges human calamities to be unmistakably the result of divine revenge,[95] and is bitterly severe on Jewish irreligion because it paid no attention to the omens which were said to have preceded the fall of Jerusalem.[96] A fair inference from his language is, that, in his opinion, if the Jews had attended to these omens and pacified the gods, their city might, or would, have escaped capture. The extent to which prejudice rendered him indifferent to truth is strikingly illustrated by his statements concerning the Jewish sanctuary. He narrates that Pompey entered it and found it empty,[97] yet in de-

---

[93] **Plutarch**, *De audiendis Poetis*, 4; *Opp. Moral*, 6, p. 73. Compare on p. 4, extract from Plutarch, *Adv. Stoic.* c. 14.

[94] Tacitus, *An.* **6**, 22, quoted in Ch. II. note 6.

[95] Tacitus, *Hist.* **1**, 3, quoted in Ch. II. note 6.

[96] "Prodigies had occurred which that race, enslaved to superstition, but opposed to religion, held it unlawful, either by vows or victims, to expiate. Embattled armies were seen rushing to the encounter, with burnished arms, and the whole Temple appeared to blaze with fire that flashed from the clouds. Suddenly the portals of the sanctuary were flung wide open, and a voice, in more than mortal accents, was heard to announce that the gods were going forth; at the same time a prodigious bustle, as of persons taking their departure; occurrences which few interpreted as indicative of impending woe."—**Tacitus**, *Hist.* **5**, 13, Bohn's trans.

[97] "Among Romans, Cneius Pompey first conquered the Jews, and by right of his victory entered their temple. Thereby was made known that

fiance of this evidence, and IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO IT, he tells us, with other hard stories, that within this sanctuary the Jews had consecrated the head of an ass.[98] Christians equally with Jews were subjects of his aversion and misrepresentation,[99] — a pretty sure evidence that both divisions of monotheism were perceptibly gaining upon heathenism.

In parting from Tacitus it is but just to say that he, like many another, may have supposed himself to believe some things which he did not. This, however, but partially excuses him, since, in such cases, the self-deception was largely his own fault. His tone is free from levity, and at times sombre even to depression.[100] This may

---

the *sedem* locality was empty, and their secret rites unmeaning, there being no effigy of gods within." — **Tacitus**, *Hist.* **5**, 9.

[98] Tacitus narrates (*Hist.* **5**, 3) that when the Jews were perishing from thirst, Moses was guided to water by a herd of wild asses, after which he states, that the Jews "consecrated in their sanctuary an effigy of the animal under whose guidance they had escaped wandering and thirst." — **Tacitus**, *Hist.* **5**, 4.

This tale, with the addition that the ass-head was of gold, is among those by which Apion endeavored to cast ridicule on the Jews. According to him (Josephus, *Against Apion*, **2**, 7, 7) it was discovered in the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes (compare Ch. VIII. note 190), an account which Josephus treats as first fabricated either by Posidonius or Apollonius. In Plutarch's *Symposiacon*, **4**, 5, 3 (*Opp.* **8**, p. 665, ed. Reiske), one of the speakers introduces the same story. We shall find hereafter that a caricature of it found place in Hadrian's palace. From a passage in Tertullian's *Apology*, 16 (repeated in his *Ad Nationes*, **1**, 11), it would seem that Christians, or at least the violently semi-Jewish ones, were also taunted with worshipping the head of an ass.

[99] See on p. 246, note 189.

[100] There is, mingled with other emotions, a mournfulness, sincere or affected, in the tone wherewith **Tacitus** (*Agric.* 46) addresses his deceased father-in-law: "If, as wise men think, GREAT minds are not extinguished with the body." It is not an ignorant and superstitious dread of physical death, but the longing for continued existence of an intelligent man, who had but faint hope that even a few favored mortals were exempted from extinction. Only the idea of a superintending good being can afford reasonable hope of a future life. The prejudices of Tacitus clung

have been due to constitutional temperament, to personal surroundings, or to both.

12. The character of the YOUNGER PLINY was soiled by levity,[101] and by some peculiarities of small minds, such as adulation[102] and cherishing a grudge.[103] He was com-

---

to a contentious, worthless rabble of deities in whose hands a thoughtful man would have been loath to trust his domestic animals, let alone the welfare of his children.

[101] This shows itself, not only in the absence of any high standard of propriety, but by adoption and defence of its opposite. Pliny amused his leisure on one occasion by writing indecencies in poetry which he sent with a letter (**4**, 14) to a friend. Had the matter stopped here it might seem some momentary failing. From a later letter, however (**5**, 3), addressed to a different person, it seems that Pliny must have recited these indecencies to others, and felt satisfaction that the individual to whom he was writing had communicated them with their author's name to friends under his roof. Some of these disapproved the composition and recital of such verses by **Pliny**. He defends himself by saying (§ 2), "I am A MAN," *homo sum*, and (§ 3) that other persons of standing had done the same. In yet another letter (**7**, 4), he speaks again of his efforts in this direction, which eventually were published. He says that he felt no regret for his publication, and treats its success (see note 106) as something glorious for himself.

Gibbon says of Pliny (in company with Thrasea, Helvidius, and Tacitus), that "from Grecian philosophy they had imbibed the justest and most liberal notions of the DIGNITY OF HUMAN NATURE." — *Decline and Fall*, 3, Vol. **1**, pp. 91, 92, Philada. edit. 1816. His words contrast strangely with Pliny's estimate of manhood. On the "liberal notions" inculcated by Greek philosophy, compare Appendix, Note K, § II. 12.

[102] Pliny's Panegyric on Trajan and his correspondence with that emperor are sufficient evidence of his adulatory tendencies. One of the titles used towards Domitian, that of "Lord," is constantly used by Pliny towards Trajan.

[103] In some trial — not impossibly a political one — before the court of One Hundred, during Domitian's reign, Pliny, as counsel, quoted the opinion of Metius Modestus, then in banishment. **Regulus**, the opposing counsel, availed himself of the mistake by asking **Pliny** (**1**, 5, § 5), "What do YOU think of Modestus?" — a question somewhat dangerous to answer in any way which would favor his case. Pliny never forgave him. When a son of Regulus died, Pliny wrote a letter (**4**, 2) to ridicule the father's somewhat extravagant manifestations of grief, and, subse-

petent to confound this latter tendency with the performance of public duty.[104] His self-esteem and love of approbation, moreover, seem to have been very strong[105]

---

quently, devoted a second letter (**4**, 7) to the same object and to ridiculing him as an orator. After his death **Pliny** writes (**6**, 2, § 4): "Regulus did well to die. He would have done yet better by dying sooner."

[104] Pliny and some other of the senatorial leaders bore a personal grudge to Publicius Certus, the man who had arrested the younger Helvidius. During his absence from the Senate, Pliny introduced a motion intended to condemn his action, but cautiously forbearing at first to name him. Partly by a ruse of the consul, the motion was carried, and Pliny seems to have accepted as truthful the congratulations of senators, because "I had at last freed the Senate from the odium with which it was universally regarded by other classes, in that, while unrelenting towards others, it, by a mutual dissimulation, was forbearing solely to senators." — **Pliny, Jun. 9**, 13, § 21. Certus was perhaps on his death-bed when the motion was introduced; see § 24 of same letter.

[105] **Pliny**, according to his own statement (**5**, 3), made it a habit to collect friends at his house and recite to them his own verses, studying meanwhile their faces and actions. "What each one thinks, he [the author] discovers from the countenance, the eyes, the motion of the head, or hand, from a murmur, or from silence." — **5**, § 9. In § 8 of the same letter he mentions that "*reverentia auditorum*, the desire of approval from his auditors," incited a closer attention to his writings, *qui recitat aliquanto acrius scriptis suis . . . intendit.*

In Book **4**, *Epistle* 19, Pliny narrates the excellences of his wife, which, as portrayed by her husband, consisted largely in admiration of himself. If he recited his productions, she took position behind some screen, where she listened (§ 3) with greedy ears to the praises of her husband, *laudesque nostras avidissimis auribus excipit.* She sung his verses (§ 4) to the harp. If he had a cause to plead in the court of One Hundred, she arranged messengers who should bring her word (§ 3) as to the *assensum*, expressions of approval, and *clamores*, outbreaks of applause, which he elicited.

In another epistle, — to which the editor has appropriately prefixed the heading, *Vanitas vanitatum Pliniarum. Omnia in hac epistola vana sunt*, Vanity of Plinian vanities. All things in this epistle are vanity, — Pliny begins: "It has frequently happened to me whilst pleading, that the court of One Hundred, after restraining themselves for a good while within the bounds of judicial dignity and gravity, would all suddenly rise and commence applauding, as if overcome and compelled

and not always discriminating.[106] He was an ultra conservative, or rather a reactionary, both in things divine and human. Despite the experience of others, he added one, or more, to existing temples;[107] and, despite the better feelings of mankind, he advocated brutalities.[108] Even when acting in the interests of humanity and not improb-

---

[thereto]. Frequently from [a meeting of] the Senate I have carried away the utmost fame which I could desire. Yet never was I so delighted as with a statement of Cornelius Tacitus. He narrated that at the last Circensian games a Roman knight sat with him; that after a variety of literary conversation this man asked him, 'Are you an Italian or a Provincial?' He answered, 'You are already acquainted with me through my pursuits.' To this the other rejoined, 'Are you Tacitus or Pliny?' I cannot express how pleased I was." — **Pliny, Jun. 9**, 23, §§ 1–3. On applause in court, compare note 47.

[106] When Pliny's more judicious friends objected to his writing and reciting indecent verses, he replied, "The book is read, copied, even sung. And by Greeks, also, — whom a love for this little book has taught Latin, — it is sung to the lyre and harp. What [else] have I accomplished equally glorious?" — **Pliny, Jun. 7**, 4, §§ 9, 10. It is probable enough, that the applause bestowed on Pliny during his private readings was not always disinterested. Persons who wished his aid may have availed themselves of his foible.

[107] Pliny mentions (Book **4**, *Epist.* 1) the erection of a temple at his own expense, and, unless the one mentioned in Book **10**, *Epistle* 24, be the same, he must have built two. Compare the experience of earlier conservatives in Ch. VIII. notes 28, 29. It would seem to have been forgotten.

[108] A friend of Pliny named Maximus lost his wife and gave an expensive gladiatorial funeral. Pliny writes to him: "You did right. . . . You had a most dear and deserving wife, to whose memory was due some monument, or public exhibition, and this of a kind especially appropriate to a funeral. . . . I could wish that the panthers, *Africanæ*, of which you had bought so many, could have arrived by the appointed day." — **Pliny, Jun. 6**, 34. If a man in cultivated society should, at the present day, celebrate the death of an affectionate wife by hiring some prize-fighters to pound each other for public amusement, the shock to public feeling would be greater, but the brutality would be less than at a Roman gladiatorial funeral. Pliny, at one time, when influenced by some of the better-minded conservatives, was willing to take ground, though not very resolutely, against these exhibitions; see note 59.

ably from benevolent motives, he seems unwilling, or ashamed, to plant himself on moral ground.[109]

This man was sent as proconsul to Bithynia under the following circumstances. That province, which in the days of Paul would seem to have been a stronghold of Judaism, had, in the days of Pliny, outgrown any belief in heathenism.[110] A reactionary administration such as surrounded Trajan could not among the sincere and right-minded Bithynians have found men willing to profess what in their section of country had become even more a subject of ridicule than at Rome. If Roman conservatives wished to put supporters of the old religion into power, they must have taken them from those who for the sake of office would become partisans of what they ridiculed in their hearts. The result of this would be maladministration and plundering of the public revenues, besides injustice and extortion towards individuals. To remedy such a state of things, Pliny was sent to Bithynia.[111] He may have been financially honest, though

---

[109] Afranius Dexter — a senator, doubtless — was found killed. Whether by his own hand or that of others was uncertain. His slaves had already been put to the torture. Pliny moved their acquittal. Another senator moved their banishment; still another, their execution. These two latter and their adherents wished to be counted conjointly. Pliny insisted on a separate count of each party. Thereupon the advocates of capital punishment, seeing that the party for acquittal outnumbered either of the others separately, joined themselves to the advocates of banishment. Pliny may have been largely prompted by a sense of justice and humanity. Yet these are ignored by him, and of his letter (**8**, 14) giving an account of it, one half is a preamble and the other a discussion of parliamentary rules.

[110] **Pliny** writes to **Trajan**: "It is sufficiently evident that the ALMOST DESERTED temples have BEGUN again to be frequented, and the religious rites, LONG INTERMITTED, to be revived, and in various localities victims are bought, for which HITHERTO only an EXCEPTIONAL purchaser, *rarissimus emptor*, was found." — Pliny, Jun. **10**, 97, 10.

[111] Pliny, in his first letter after arriving in Bithynia, writes to Trajan: "Much [public] money is retained by private individuals, and some is applied to by no means legitimate expenses." — **Pliny, Jun. 10**, 28, 3. **Trajan** answers: "The provincials will, I trust, understand that I

our knowledge of his life is inadequate to warrant an affirmation to that effect. Among honest men, however, a more unfit one could hardly have been selected. We have already seen, in his dealing with Dio Chrysostom, that the simple cry, "Religion is in danger," rendered him incompetent to see through and adjust an ordinary business account. If, unknown to Trajan, some of the Bithynian plunderers had exercised an influence in having Pliny appointed, the instance would be but one of too many in which a political ring operates unseen by the public.

Contractors, whose work had, by connivance, been over-measured,[112] office-holders, who had appropriated public moneys, and others generally who were concerned in defrauding the community, knew that Pliny had been sent to correct such abuses, and that his self-love would make him desire the reputation of having accomplished his mission. They needed, therefore, to divert his attention, and the cry which they raised concerning Christians effected, doubtless, their purpose. The province was, according to Pliny's statement, full of Christians belonging

---

exercise forethought for them. . . . Your first duty will be to exact account of public matters, for it is plain enough that they are out of order."—*Ibid.* **10**, 29, 2, 3. These letters are numbered in some editions 16 and 17.

In another letter (**10**, 40) Pliny mentions that condemned criminals had not only escaped punishment, but been put into salaried offices. Trajan responds (**10**, 41) that Pliny had been sent to correct such abuses.

The Bithynians had previously made more than one effort for self-protection. They had accused one of their proconsuls, named Bassus, of bribery and extortion (Pliny, Jun. **4**, 9). Varenus, who aided them in this prosecution, may possibly have done so from interested motives. He became their proconsul, and was in his turn the subject of an accusation (Pliny, Jun. **5**, 20; **6**, 13). In either case Pliny aided the accused, though his letters render their guilt probable.

[112] Pliny asks Trajan (**10**, 28, ?) for a surveyor, or measurer, from Rome, to remeasure public works. The emperor replies (**10**, 29, 3) that he has hardly measurers enough for works in Rome and its vicinity. Some insight is afforded by this confession into the industrial condition of Rome. Cp. (Ch. IV. n. 6) remark of Josephus on mechanical arts.

to every rank and condition. An effort to extirpate them would of course give him plenty to do. Some accusations, anonymous or otherwise, may have been prompted by a wish of delinquents to put out of the way testimony which could not be rebutted. Other accusations, after the persecution commenced, may have been the result of private grudge. None of them, if we consider the absence of belief in heathenism (see note 110), can have proceeded from religious motives.

The degree to which Pliny and Trajan were influenced by reverence for the heathen deities receives some illustration from the fact that two questions addressed by the former to the latter received contradictory answers,[113] and is also evinced by Pliny's praise of his uncle,[114] a decided atheist.[115]

Pliny states, with no intimation of doubt as to its correctness, the alleged object of the Christians, that they bound themselves to rectitude of life; and then proceeds to term their association "a depraved and extravagant superstition," *superstitionem pravam et immodicam*.[116] The remark, IN SUCH A CONNECTION, sounds like utter blockheadism. Yet the main object of Pliny's letter may have been, and not improbably was, to obtain imperial indorsement for avoidance of further persecution. His natural feelings, aided doubtless by expressions of indignation from the better portion of the community, were likely to cause hesitation in the work wherein treasury delinquents

---

[113] In letters 58, 75, of Book **10**, we have Pliny's propositions, and in letters 59, 76, we have Trajan's answers. According to these latter it appears that ground dedicated to the "Mother of the Gods" must not interfere with city improvements, but ground dedicated to "Claudius," the deified emperor, could not be diverted from sacred uses. The former of these decisions is accompanied by a statement, that the soil of a foreign city did not admit a dedication which would be binding by Roman law. The latter decision assumes the reverse. Provincials would naturally infer that a deified emperor was more to be revered than the "Mother of the Gods."

[114] See letter of Pliny, Jun. **6**, 16.

[115] Pliny, Sen. *Nat. Hist.* **2**, 5, 4.

[116] **Pliny, Jun. 10**, 97, 7, 8.

and others had involved him. His meaning might be paraphrased thus: "I should like to escape from this predicament, and will therefore explain to the emperor that the men do no wrong. I should dislike to be thought an untrue patrician, and will therefore call them some opprobrious names."

13. In connection with Pliny's letter concerning Christians, two questions naturally present themselves. Pliny speaks of Christians as being denounced to him, but he does not mention any other class of monotheists. If the accusation had come from Jews, this would need no explanation, since they would not have accused their own converts. There is, however, no reason to think that Jews were connected with it. The question therefore arises, Were Christians the only GENTILE monotheists in Bithynia? And, if so, what caused a difference, in this respect, between that province and Rome? At Rome we have seen that, conjointly with Christians, other monotheists were expelled.[117] Juvenal also mentions conversions to Judaism.[118] If this difference between Rome and Bithynia really existed, there seems but one plausible explanation of it. At Rome the aristocracy had cultivated a factitious reverence for antiquity. This reverence might incline many Gentiles towards Judaism, rather than towards Christianity, on the ground that the former religion was sanctioned by its antiquity. In Bithynia, if no such factitious reverence existed, Christian customs would have

---

[117] See notes 29, 44.

[118] "Some — children of a father, who has an awe for sabbaths —
Adore nothing but clouds and the divinity of heaven.
They think swine's flesh [for food] on a par with human.
Their father did not touch it. After while they circumcise themselves.
Accustomed to contemn Roman laws,
They learn, observe, and feel an awe for Jewish legislation,
For whatever Moses handed down in his secret volume: —
Not to show the way, save to one of the same faith,
To lead only circumcised to the desired fountain.
His father is responsible; to whom each seventh day
Was idle, and disconnected from life's interests."

Juvenal, *Sat.* **14**, 96 – 106.

presented to a Gentile fewer objections than Jewish ones, whilst the teachings of Christianity would at least have proved equally acceptable with those of Judaism.

It deserves note that a Roman consul, Flavius Clemens, a relative of Domitian, should have been executed in A. D. 95, on a charge of atheism. At a somewhat later date this would unquestionably have meant that he was a Christian.[119] It perhaps meant so now.

14. A second question arises touching the name "Christian." In Asia we have several instances of its use.[120] In Europe, as we learn from Tacitus, the common people used the same term.[121] Among other classes the terms A-theist, Unbeliever, or Galilean[122] seem to have prevailed. The only two instances in Europe where the word "Christian" is either used, or its use implied, are cases in which an accusation was probably made by Jews.[123] The data are too meagre for the formation of a certain opinion. Yet they favor the supposition that where Jews were most numerous, and the expectation of a Christ most familiar, the term "Christian" was more generally used than in other localities.

---

[119] See Appendix, Note B, § II. 2.

[120] Besides Pliny's letter to Trajan, **10**, 97, see Acts of the Apostles **11**, 26; **26**, 28; and 1 Peter **4**, 16.

[121] *Quos . . . vulgus Christianos adpellabat*, "Those whom the common people called Christians." — Tac. *An.* **15**, 44.

[122] See quotations from Dio Cassius and Justin Martyr in Appendix, Note B, foot-notes 52, 53, 54. Epictetus, *In Dissertat.* **4**, 7, 6, uses the term "Galileans." At a date when the term "Christians" must already have been familiar to European Jews, that is, about A. D. 60, we find, even in Asia, that in speaking to a Roman governor, the epithet "Nazarene" is adopted. Paul is called (Acts **24**, 5) "a leader of the party of the Nazarenes," though in the same city two years later a Jewish monarch, in addressing Paul (Acts **26**, 28), uses the term "Christian."

The Martyrdom of Polycarp evinces (cc. 3, 9) the term "A-theist" to have been in use also at Smyrna in Asia.

[123] See page 229, also note 189 of Chapter VIII.

§ v. *A. D.* 98–117. *Trajan.*

Part of Trajan's reign has been treated under the preceding section. Pliny, in his already-mentioned letter to Trajan, says: "I have never been present at examinations concerning Christians." This may either have referred to examinations prior to Trajan's reign, or during it. If the latter be Pliny's meaning, it implies that the Christians had already, before he went to Bithynia, suffered in some localities because the reactionary tendencies of Trajan's court had failed to protect them. Eusebius, who wrote two centuries later, mentions that local persecutions occurred under Trajan,[124] but we cannot from his narrative infer their number, extent, or chronological order. Hegesippus, an earlier writer whom he quotes, places the martyrdom of Simeon about A. D. 116. If so, it probably took place during the Jewish troubles near the close of Trajan's reign. The "Martyrdom of Ignatius" is an unreliable document, written probably as a means of giving currency to the epistles forged in his name. Its fabrication, however, renders probable the existence of some tradition that Ignatius had been martyred in Trajan's time.

Several collisions occurred in Trajan's reign between Jews and Gentiles, or between Jews and the imperial

---

[124] Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* **3**, 32. The tendency of Trajan's reign favored patricianism perhaps to a greater extent than his judgment or inclination warranted. A coin of Trajan (Oros. **7**, 11, note) states by word and emblem that sacrifice of oxen should render Rome eternal. **Pliny** lauds him (*Panegyr.* **42**, 2) because "slaves have been taught their duty. They fear, obey, and have masters." Yet Pliny's letter (**3**, 14) on the murder of a brutal slaveholder by his slaves, indicates the result, in this direction, of patrician tendencies. Pliny lauds Trajan (*Panegyr.* **36**, 1) because the treasury was no longer guarded. The financial and official condition of Bithynia as described by himself is a comment on similar neglect there. Pliny, in consulting Trajan (*Epist.* **10**, 71; al. 66) touching one whom Trajan's answer (**10**, 72; al. 67) treats as lawlessly enslaved, mentions, among cited authorities, the "god" Augustus, the "god" Vespasian, the "god" Titus, but it is noteworthy that a decision of Domitian outweighed with Trajan the divine ones.

forces. The scanty records left us throw little light on the cause of these collisions. The reactionary influences which marked the reign of Trajan render not improbable that already in his time the law of Domitian and Nerva, which forbade making eunuchs, had been misapplied as a prohibition to Jews of their national rite.

In the year 115, Antioch, in Syria, had the unenviable honor of a residence within its walls by Trajan and his court. The city was full of soldiery and embassies, and overrun with hangers-on and with adventurers from every quarter of the earth. Suddenly a long-continued earthquake shook the city to its foundations, and amidst the crash of buildings, the fearful loss of life, and the mangling of human limbs, Trajan, with slight injury, was helped through a window and escaped to open ground. Pedo, the consul, was killed. Trees were, according to Dio Cassius, uprooted by the earthquake's violence.[125] A rebellion of Jews in Cyrene and Egypt and the island of Cyprus followed soon afterwards. The earthquake may have been regarded as a manifestation of divine indignation towards the head of heathenism, or the rebellion may have been due to Roman acts of oppression.

Of the brutalities which Dio Cassius attributes to the Jews during this revolt, some are such obvious fabrications that their currency among heathens implies stupid or vindictive credulity.[126] Others may be exaggerations

[125] Dio Cassius narrates the earthquake and its attendant circumstances in Book **68**, chapters 24, 25.

[126] "Meanwhile [after the Antioch earthquake] the Jews of Cyrene, putting at their head a certain Andrew, killed the Romans and Greeks, fed on their flesh, distributed (?) their entrails, anointed themselves with their blood, and clothed themselves with their skins. They sawed many in two from their head downwards; others they gave to wild beasts; others they compelled to fight [mortal] duels; so that two hundred and twenty thousand in all were destroyed. In Egypt they did many similar things, and in Cyprus under the lead of Artemion. Two hundred and forty thousand were put to death there. And on this account it is not lawful for a Jew to land in Cyprus; but if any one forced by the wind is driven upon the island, he is put to death. Lucius, sent by Trajan, and also other generals, subdued the Jews." — **Dio Cass. 68**, 32. Before

of actual facts. The number alleged to have perished needs, doubtless, as in most ancient narratives, a very great reduction to render it truthful.[127]

Eusebius records this revolt under Trajan without ascribing barbarities to the Jews.[128] He wrote at a date

---

deciding as to the truthfulness or absurdity of the foregoing, the reader will do well to compare note 190 of Chapter VIII. and also the following extract concerning a revolt, during our own time, in the island of Cuba: "*La Integridad Nacional*, a newspaper published in Madrid, recently contained a series of foul slanders against Francis Sanvalle, the celebrated naturalist, and owner of the Regla Slating Foundry. The slanders were that Sanvalle was an insurgent general, that he had assassinated eleven Spaniards, that he then caused a fire of fagots to be built, on which were placed the bodies of his victims, and that, when the torch was applied, himself and his band danced around the blazing mass. Sanvalle is incapable of such barbarities. He is an American who is far advanced in years, devoted to his science, and has never meddled in the revolution. Throughout the island he is much respected because of his accomplishments, and has a high standing in social and scientific circles." — **New York Semi-Weekly Tribune**, December 2, 1870.

[127] Cæsar, even, who has been thought to avoid exaggeration, states (*Bell. Gal.* **1**, 29) the number of his enemies — men, women, and children — at three hundred and sixty-eight thousand; and in another place (*Bell. Gal.* **7**, 76), at two hundred and forty-eight thousand. Half such a number aggregated in one neighborhood, with nothing but ancient means of transportation, would seem likely to have starved.

[128] "The condition of Christianity, and of the [Christian] assembly, flourishing more and more daily, made progress, whilst Jewish misfortune, owing to evil upon evil, was at its height. Early in the emperor's eighteenth year [A. D. 115] a commotion of Jews again taking place caused destruction to a great multitude of them. In Alexandria and the remainder of Egypt and also in Cyrene, being inflamed as if by some fearful revolutionary spirit, they rushed into revolt against their fellow-residents, the Greeks; and by adding greatly to the revolt, they commenced in the following year a war of no small proportions, Lupus being then in command in Egypt. In the first contest they happened to get the better of the Greeks, who flying into Alexandria seized and killed the Jews in that city.

"The Cyrenian [Jews], with no aid from these [Egyptian] ones, steadily plundered Egyptian territory and overthrew its laws, under the lead of Lucuas; against whom the emperor sent Marcius Turbo with a foot and

when no friendly feeling existed between them and Christians, nor is there any reason for supposing that such feeling influenced his recital. He tells us, moreover, that he was but copying verbally from heathen records. This causes additional distrust of the atrocities mentioned by the credulous and prejudiced Dio.

The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, or the records quoted by it, make no mention of the revolt in Cyprus. His Chronicon, both in the original and in Jerome's translation, specifies Salamis, a single city of the island, as being destroyed and its inhabitants killed by the Jews. A natural inference is, that the other cities and towns of the island were not so treated. The discord of a seaport population may have made it an exception to the course of things elsewhere.

The destruction, or expulsion, of the Mesopotamian Jews, mentioned by Eusebius, was perhaps a military measure connected with Trajan's expedition in that direction, and the fear of their attacking their neighbors may have been a fiction to justify the intended procedure.

There is extant a Sibylline passage which may have owed its origin to the events of Trajan's latter years,[129]

---

naval force and also with cavalry. He, carrying the war against them through, with many battles during a considerable period of time, destroyed many myriads, not only of Cyrenian but also of Egyptian Jews who had joined their king Lucuas.

"The emperor, suspecting that the Jews in Mesopotamia were about to attack the inhabitants there, commanded Lucius Cyetus (or Quietus) to clear them from that eparchy. He, drawing together an army, murdered a large number of them, upon which success he was appointed, by the emperor, governor of Judæa.

"Greek [that is, Gentile] writers of that date have narrated these matters in the same words." — **Eusebius**, *Ecc. Hist.* **4**, 2.

129 "There shall be at some future time a dry sea,
Ships shall no longer sail to Italy.
Asia then shall be the all-carrying water;
And the plain of Crete as also Cyprus shall suffer much.
And Paphos shall bewail a terrible fate, so that [even]
The much-suffering city of Salamis shall gaze at her."
Sibyl. Orac. 5, 447–452.

In Book **4**, line 128, the destruction conjointly of Salamis and Paphos

though this is not certain. If another passage in the note belong to the same period, there must have been Jews who were thinking more of Egypt's conversion than of her destruction.[130]

---

by an earthquake is mentioned. In that connection it belongs apparently to Nero's time.

[130] Sibylline verses prior to the middle of the first century seem to have been written exclusively for the Roman or Italian market; see Appendix, Note A, § v. 3. It is doubtful even whether the same remark does not hold good concerning them until about the close of that century. If these verses were intended to operate at Rome, they may date before the Christian era. If they were intended to operate in Egypt, they probably belong to the close of Trajan's reign, or the earlier years of Hadrian's.

"Isis, thrice-wretched goddess, thou shalt remain solitary by the Nile's water;
A disorderly madwoman on the sands of Acheron.
No longer in the whole earth shall remembrance of thee remain.
And thou, Serapis, on a bed of stones shalt suffer distress.
Thou shalt lie, the greatest ruin in thrice-wretched Egypt.
All who led the desires of Egypt towards thee
Shall bewail thee bitterly. But such as put immortal understanding in their minds,
As many as earnestly hymn God, shall recognize thee as nothing.
And some one of the priests, a linen-robed man, will say:
'Come, let us set apart a truly beautiful spot for God.
Come, let us change the horrible law of our ancestors,
Because of which they made feasts and processions
Senselessly to stone and earthenware gods.
Let us turn our hearts and earnestly hymn the immortal God,
The Originator, who has eternally existed,
The true Director of all things, their King,
The life-sustaining Originator, the Great God, who endures forever.
And then in Egypt shall a mighty temple be pure,
And into it a God-begotten people shall bring sacrifices,
And God will grant them to live immortally.'"

Sibyl. Orac. 5, 484 – 503.

The mention of a future temple other than that at Jerusalem is equally remarkable, whether we suppose these lines to have been written before or after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus.

§ VI. *A. D.* 117–138. *Hadrian.*

Hadrian on his accession, aided by popular indignation, reformed many abuses,[131] repressed a patrician conspiracy, executed (Spartianus, 7, 8) four consular senators, and lived as a result in fear of assassination,[131a] anxious, apparently, by acts of folly misnamed piety, to preclude charges of deserting the state religion.[131b] When misapplication of a benevolent law caused the Jews to rebel, he may have feared lest, if he decided in their favor, he should be stigmatized as protector of 'Foreign Rites,' and may for this reason have left (see Ch. VII. note 87) all responsibility to the judges. The rebellion began[131c] A. D. 131 or 132, if not earlier (before the death of Antinous? Spartian. 13) and may have been preceded by local outbreaks.

Spartianus states that circumcision was forbidden to the Jews, and that this prohibition originated the rebellion.[132] Dio Cassius says that it was caused by Hadrian's location of a Roman colony on the ruins of Jerusalem, and his erection of a temple to Jupiter where the Jewish one had

---

[131] Hadrian "relinquished many provinces acquired by Trajan." — **Spartianus**, 8. "Going through the provinces he punished procurators and head officers for their deeds." — **Spartian.** 12. "He forbade killing of slaves by their masters [cp. note 124], and commanded their condemnation by judges if they deserved it. . . . If a master had been killed at home he commanded that torture should not be applied to all his slaves, but only to those near enough to be aware of it. — **Spartian.** 17. "He separated the baths for the sexes." — *Ibid.*

[131a] Hadrian said: "The condition of emperors is miserable who, until killed, are not believed as to plots against them." — **Gallicanus**, *Avid. Cass.* 2.

[131b] "He did many pious acts [cp. Ch. VI. note 34] through fear lest what had happened to Domitian should result to him." — **Spartian.** 19.

[131c] Smith, *Dict. of Biog.* **2**, 321, col. 2, 322, col. 1; **3**, 1378, col. 2; Eusebius, *Chronicon*, *Hadrian*, 16.

[132] "*Moverunt ea tempestate et Judæi bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia.*" — **Spartianus**, *Hadrian*, 13; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 12. Edicts of Domitian and Nerva (see notes 40, 45) against making eunuchs, probably used the term *mutilare genitalia*, which patrician judges could misapply against Jews.

stood.[133] Probably the decree, or the misapplication of it, mentioned by Spartianus, originated, and the facts mentioned by Dio gave a new impulse to, the war.

---

[133] "When he (Hadrian) built on the ruins of Jerusalem a city, which he called Ælia Capitolina, and erected on the site of [their] God's temple another to Jupiter, a war was excited which proved of no small dimensions nor short duration. For the Jews, treating it as something horrible that other races should be colonized in their city, and that the sacred rites of foreigners should be established in it, forbore action whilst Hadrian was present in Ægypt and afterwards in Syria. But, so far as possible, they purposely made the arms required from them of an inferior kind, that, on their condemnation, they themselves might have the use of them. When [Hadrian] was gone, they openly revolted. They did not venture in open battle any desperate attempt against the Romans. But they occupied suitable localities, and strengthened them by underground passages and walls, that they might have places of refuge when overcome, and might [have room to] pass each other unseen beneath the ground. Holes were bored upwards to admit air and light.

"At first the Romans in talking made light of them. But when all Judæa was in commotion, and the Jews were everywhere in disturbance and holding meetings, and had done much mischief to the Romans both privately and publicly, and when MANY OF OTHER RACES had from the desire of gain [?] ASSISTED THEM, and all the inhabited world, thus to speak, was in commotion, then Hadrian sent against them his best commanders, of whom the most prominent was Julius Severus. He was despatched against the Jews from Britain, which he governed.

"He at first nowhere ventured a conflict with his opponents, because of their number and desperation, but by taking them singly [that is, in small bodies] with a multitude of [his own] soldiers and officers, and cutting off their provisions and shutting them up, he was enabled, more slowly, indeed, but with less danger, to crush, wear out, and cut them off. But few, therefore, altogether escaped. Fifty of their most considerable strongholds and nine hundred and eighty-five of their most noted villages were thoroughly destroyed, and five hundred and eighty thousand men were killed by onslaughts and in battles. The number destroyed by hunger, disease, and fire could not be ascertained. All Judæa, with slight exception, was rendered a desert, as already before the war had been foreshown to them [the Jews]. For the sepulchre of Solomon, which they regard as one of their sacred structures, went to pieces of its own accord and fell; also many wolves and hyenas made forays, howling, into their cities. But many also of the Romans perished in

The contest, so far as carried on outside of Judæa, must have had one peculiarity of a civil war. It was not a conflict between contiguous or remote nations, but between neighbors. Further, the moral and religious influence of the Jews was likely, in the outset of the contest, to give them many friends and sympathizers among such heathens as could appreciate rightness of life. This sympathy must have been increased by the obvious denial of a long-recognized religious liberty, and by the intentional insult to Jewish feeling in the erection of a temple to Jupiter at Jerusalem when Jupiter himself had, among nearly all intelligent heathens, become obsolete, save as a means of tormenting Jews and Christians. Some heathens may, as Dio Cassius says, have aided the Jews from love of gain, but it is probable that others from a sense of justice gave them support, and that still others, who refrained from supporting, gave them, from motives of justice or humanity, protection. In some localities each man's hand must have been against his neighbor.[134]

---

this war. Wherefore Hadrian, when he wrote to the Senate, did not use the preface customary from emperors: 'If you and your children are in health, it is well. I and the armies are in health.'

"He sent Severus [after the war] into Bithynia, which had no need of arms, but of a just and wise ruler and presiding officer who had resolution; all which qualifications belonged to Severus. And [Severus] so conducted and administered private and public matters, that even to the present time mention is constantly made of him. But to the Senate and to the lot Pamphylia was conceded instead of Bithynia." — **Dio Cass. 69,** 12-14.

This last remark implies, apparently, that the senators considered it their special privilege to plunder Bithynia and supply their friends with offices at its expense. They had to be indemnified with another province.

[134] The book found in the Apocrypha of the Old Testament under the title of 2d Esdras was written (see Appendix, Note E) in the time of Hadrian. Some of its passages have much that is apposite to a state of things which we could infer without it. The following extract is from the common version, except verse 26, for which I have substituted the corresponding verses (**4,** 30, 31) in Laurence's translation from the Ethiopic.

"And suddenly shall the sown places appear unsown, the full store-

In the Second Book of Esdras are found questionings [135]

houses shall suddenly be found empty, and the trumpet shall give a sound, which when every man heareth they shall be suddenly afraid [or startled]. AT THAT TIME SHALL FRIENDS FIGHT, ONE AGAINST ANOTHER, LIKE ENEMIES, and the earth shall stand in fear, with those that dwell therein, the springs of the fountains shall stand still, and in three hours [Ethiopic, "three years"] they shall not run.

"Whosoever remaineth, from all these things that I have told thee, shall escape and see my salvation at the end of your [Ethiopic, "the"] world. In that day they shall behold those men [Enoch and Elijah] who have ascended [into heaven] without tasting death from their birth.

"The hearts of those who dwell in the world shall be changed, and another heart be given to them. For evil shall be put out and deceit shall be quenched. As for faith, it shall flourish, corruption shall be overcome, and the truth which hath been so long without fruit shall be declared." **2 Esdras, 6,** 22–28; Laurence's trans. **4,** 25–32.

A similar reference to this conflict of neighbors exists in the preceding chapter. It is here given in the translation of Laurence: "FRIENDS OPPOSED TO FRIENDS SHALL DESTROY EACH OTHER. Wisdom shall in that day be concealed and understanding be withdrawn to her secret residence; while many shall seek but shall not find her; and iniquity and folly shall be multiplied on the earth." — **2 Esdras, 3,** 14, 15; corresponding to the common version, **5,** 9, 10.

In yet another passage these conflicts are represented as uncontrolled by military or civil authority. "Woe to the world and them that dwell therein, . . . for there shall be sedition among men and invading one another. They shall not regard their kings nor princes [i. e. their leaders] and the course of their actions shall stand in their [own] power. A man shall desire to go into a city and shall not be able. . . . A man shall have no pity upon his neighbor, but shall destroy their houses with the sword, and spoil their goods because of the lack of bread and for great tribulation." — **2 Esdras, 15,** 14–19. The two concluding chapters, of which this extract forms a part, are not found in the Ethiopic nor Arabic. The destitution, mentioned in verse 19, would necessarily be more severe at the close than at the beginning of the war.

[135] "Are their deeds, then, any better which inhabit Babylon, that they should therefore have the dominion over Sion? . . . Is there any other people that knoweth thee besides Israel? Or what race hath so believed thy covenants as Jacob? And yet their reward appeareth not and their labor hath no fruit: for I have gone here and there through the heathen, and I see that they flow in wealth, and think not upon thy command-

and hopes,[136] such as were not unnatural in a Jewish mind after the terrible struggle. The edict, or misapplication of law, against circumcision, must either have been repealed, or, which is more probable, allowed to sleep, for the Jews retained their rite in the second century as ever since. Hadrian may have found that the cost of executing it would be too much. The bitterness which grew up during the prolonged conflict can be inferred from passages of 2 Esdras,[137] but can best be judged by its effects. To these we will attend in the next chapter.

The Psalms of Solomon contain allusions which identify them, or a portion of them, as belonging to the present period.[138] They throw some, though but little, light upon it.

---

ments. Weigh thou, therefore, our wickedness in the balance, and theirs also that dwell in the world; and so shall thy name nowhere be found but in Israel. Or when was it that they which dwell upon the earth have not sinned in thy sight? Or what people hath so kept thy commandments? Thou shalt find that Israel by name hath kept thy precepts; but not the heathen. . . . It was not my mind to be curious of the high things, but of such as pass by us daily, namely, wherefore Israel is given up as a reproach to the heathen, and for what cause the people whom thou hast loved is given over unto ungodly nations, and why the law of our forefathers is brought to nought, and the written covenants come to none effect." — **2 Esdras, 3**, 28, 32-36; **4**, 23.

[136] See extracts from 2 Esdras on pp. 131-134.

[137] See the mention of Jewish suffering quoted on page 131 in note 38, from Laurence's translation of Ezra, **10**, 32-34 (Lat. vers. **10**, 22).

[138] The Psalms of Solomon are published in Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, **1**, pp. 917-972. One of them attributes the sufferings of the Jews to their sins: "They have omitted no sin which they have not perpetrated even more than the Gentiles. Therefore God . . . brought the Hardstriker from the ends of the earth." — **Ps. 8**, 14-16. The allusion is, doubtless, to Julius Severus, brought from Britain to put down the Jews.

In another Psalm it is said: "The blast has desolated our land of its inhabitants. It has carried off together the young man and the old, and their children, . . . and all things which were done in Jerusalem as the Gentiles do in their cities to their gods." — **Ps. 17**, 13 and 16.

These passages compared with each other seem to attribute the mis-

CHAPTER XI.

EFFECTS OF THE JEWISH REVOLT UNDER HADRIAN.

§ 1. *Direct Effects.*

In enumerating the direct and indirect effects of this Jewish revolt, we shall pass over such matters as the exhumed picture belonging to Hadrian's time,[1] and con-

---

fortunes of Jerusalem and Judæa to the fact that a portion of the Jews fraternized with and imitated heathens, and God was determined to have no half-way worshippers. Not impossibly such men are alluded to in **Ps. 4**, verse 7, as "living hypocritically with the righteous," and in verse 8 as "man-pleasers," and in verse 10 as "a man-pleaser, who utters the Law deceitfully."

The probable explanation of this is, that Jews of the ultra conservative stamp at Jerusalem had, whilst the war was in embryo, endeavored, by extra complaisance towards heathenism, to avert the storm. Some may, equally with Herod in the times of Augustus or Herod Agrippa in the reign of Claudius, have been willing to half-heathenize themselves. Of this class were those who endeavored to throw the blame of any commotion upon the Christians. The reader will find, under Note B of the Appendix, in foot-note 53, a message from Jews, certainly of this class, which, whether it belong to the times of Trajan or Hadrian, would seem superfluous, unless there were a desire to exonerate themselves at the expense of Christians.

[1] In the **Cleveland Daily Herald** for March 31, 1860, is a communication founded on, or copied from, a letter of **Lewis Cass, Jr.** It states that on the Palatine Hill, among ruins of the "House of Gold of the Cæsars," had been found, scratched on a wall, a picture of a crucified human figure with an ass-head. To the left is a man with one hand raised, and below is the inscription, "Alexander adores God."

Merivale, in his *History of the Romans* (Vol. **6**, p. 442, note 1), copies from the **Dublin Review** for March, 1857, essentially the same account, but with the subscription, Ἀλεξάμενος σίβεται θεόν, "Alexamenus recognizes (or reverences) God," and says that it was exhumed on the Aventine Hill.

The former article says, that the chamber containing the picture, and

fine ourselves to such as affected society or literature. To do this, we again interrupt the chronological narrative.

1. GNOSTICS, OR ANTI-JEWISH CHRISTIANS.

First on our list stand THE GNOSTICS, two bodies of Christians strikingly unlike each other, who sprung into existence during or immediately after the war.[2] They held in common this prominent and distinguishing view, The God of the Jews is not the God of Christians, but a different and less perfect being.[3] They lasted until sur-

---

that portion of the palace to which it belongs, were "built by Hadrian, as the bricks, of which it is chiefly composed, attest. They are impressed with the names and titles of the consuls Pactinus and Apronicanus [Pætinus and Apronianus, A. D. 123]." If so, the picture is probably some sarcasm on a Jew, or on the Jews. Crucifixion of their leaders, or of themselves, may have suggested a representation of their alleged god (see Ch. X. note 98) as having been crucified.

[2] Historical evidence places their origin in the time of Hadrian. The war is the only occurrence during his reign which can account for them. Clement of Alexandria says: "In the times of the Emperor Hadrian appeared those who devised heresies, and they continued until the age of the elder Antoninus." — **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **7**, § 106, p. 898. Clement enumerates Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion as contemporaries. Tertullian states (*Adv. Marc.* **1**, 19) that Marcion came from Pontus to Rome in the reign of the elder Antoninus, though he does not know in what year. Elsewhere (*De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, 30) he says that Marcion and Valentinus belonged to the time of Antoninus. Irenæus (*Against Heresies*, **3**, 4, 3) seems to imply that Valentinus came to Rome before the time of Antoninus Pius, in whose reign he became prominent. These men were most prominent, therefore, in the reign which began immediately after the war closed. Samuel, the Armenian chronologist, places Valentinus and Cerdo, a Marcionite, about four years before Hadrian's death. Cerdo came to Rome before Marcion. The Chronicon of Eusebius places Basilides about the same time, and the close of the war a year or two later.

[3] **Mr. Norton**, in his work on the *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. **2** pp. 24–28 (first edition), has collected evidence of the above statements. From his work (pp. 27, 28) the following is copied: —

"'I will endeavor,' says **Origen** (*Apud Pamphili Mart. Apolog.* pro Origene; in Origen. Opp. **4**, Append. p. 22), 'to define who is a heretic.

vivors of the struggle, with the recollection of its bitterness, had passed away, and then they died out. No satisfactory explanation of their existence can be offered, except that they were the result of the war. It is impossible that their origin was due to any literary influence, since their mental tendencies were extremely divergent. They could not have originated in any merely local influence, since they sprung up in widely separated localities.

To appreciate this let the reader imagine to himself one class — the Valentinians, from Alexandria in Egypt — as extravagant idealists, whose peculiarities of language were such as not to admit translation into our or into any other tongue; men who invented a fanciful phraseology, using the same word in two or more senses, thereby concealing their inconsistencies from themselves and from such others as pretended to understand them. Let him next imagine another class — the Marcionites from Pontus of Asia Minor — as plain even to bluntness in their speech and as accommodating their teachings to the simplest minds.

The Valentinians, in reconciling the Gospels with their system, escaped difficulties partly by ignoring them and partly by spiritual interpretation of the passages, that is, by ascribing to them meanings not suggested by the context, nor perhaps by anything else save the interpreter's fancy. Marcion felt bound to face difficulties, even at the cost of forced interpretation and the pruning-knife.[4]

All who profess to believe in Christ, and yet affirm that there is one God of the Law and the Prophets, and another of the Gospels, and maintain that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ was not he who was proclaimed by the Law and the Prophets, but another, I know not what, God, wholly unknown and unheard of, — all such we consider as heretics, however they may set off their doctrines with different fictions. Such are the followers of Marcion, and Valentinus, and Basilides.'"

[4] A word of explanation must precede Marcion's doings and interpretations, so that readers unfamiliar with Gnosticism may see their object. He, in common with the other branch of Gnostics, believed matter to be evil. He could not, therefore, ascribe to Jesus a physical body, without ascribing to this portion of him imperfection. Instead of building up, as did the other branch of Gnostics, a fanciful explanation, he cut away

The Valentinians, though using all four Gospels, seem to have made most use of John's. Marcion assumed that

---

the earlier years of our Saviour's history and began nearly as follows: "In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, Christ Jesus, a saving spirit, deigned (?) to descend from heaven (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* **1**, 19) into Capernaum, a city of Galilee." — **Tertull.** *Adv. Marc.* **4**, 7. In an omitted portion of this last passage *deum* is sometimes incorrectly substituted for *cum*, which would make the two passages conflict.

In accordance with the above, the words recorded by **Matthew 12**, 48, "Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?" were, by Marcion, interpreted as meaning, I have no parents, "I was not born." — **Tertull.** *Adv. Marc.* **4**, 19.

In **Luke 22**, 70, "All [the chief priests and scribes] said, 'You are, therefore, the Son of God,'" that is, the Messiah whom OUR God is to send. The answer of Jesus, "YE say that I am," was interpreted by Marcion (**Tertull.** *Adv. Marc.* **4**, 41) as meaning, "*I* have not said so." Marcion, it may be remarked, believed that the Jewish Deity would yet send HIS Messiah to his peculiar people.

The voice from heaven (**Luke 9**, 35), "This is my beloved son, hear HIM," meant, according to Marcion (Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* **4**, 22), "Do not listen to Moses and Elijah," who are present with him.

The foregoing were intended as solutions of difficulties. Other passages, which Marcion understood as directly inculcating his views, may interest the reader.

In **Matthew 9**, 16, and **Mark 2**, 21, are the words of Jesus: "No one puts a patch of new cloth upon an old garment." Tertullian's argument (*Adv. Marc.* **3**, 16) implies, without affirming, that Marcion understood Jesus as thereby alleging a total absence of connection between his revelation and, not merely the customs of the Jews, but the revelation made to them.

According to **Luke 10**, 22, Jesus says, "No one knoweth who the Son is save the Father, and who the Father is save the Son, and he to whom the Son may wish to reveal him." **Tertullian** (*Adv. Marc.* **4**, 25) quotes the comment of Marcion on this: "And so Christ preached a [previously] unknown God." Other heretics, according to Tertullian, LAID STRESS on the same passage, "*Hinc enim et alii Hæretici fulciuntur.*" By other heretics he means, as his context implies, other Gnostics.

One passage of **Paul**, if disconnected from much of his other teaching, could be readily construed to favor Gnostic views. He speaks in **2 Corinth. 4**, 4, of those "in whom the god of this world (or 'of this age') hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving so that they cannot see

Luke, the companion of Paul, would be most free from Jewish prejudices. He adopted, therefore, his narrative as a basis, expunging from it what he deemed Jewish misconceptions or additions, and incorporating into it from the other Gospels such passages as he could press into his service.

Marcion believed in three heavens, the system alluded to by Paul in 2 Cor. **12**, 2. He deemed the uppermost, or third, heaven the residence of the Supreme Being, and a lower one that of the Jewish God.[5] The Valentinians believed, in accordance with Alexandrine views, that the earth was spanned by seven heavens. These, equally with the earth, were, in their view, created by the Jewish Deity who dwelt in or over the seventh heaven. Above the heavens, separated by an immense "Middle Space," was the Pleroma, or "Fulness," where the Supreme Being dwelt. It was doubtless the sphere of the fixed stars.[6]

Marcion held the popular view concerning the underworld as a subterranean cavern. The Valentinians deemed our earth the underworld, or realm of darkness.[7]

---

the light of the glorious gospel of Christ." Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* **5**, 11) tells us that Marcion understood the god of this world to be the Creator, or God of the Jews.

[5] See "*Belief of the First Three Centuries concerning Christ's Mission to the Underworld*," § XXI. 2, pp. 109, 110; 3d edit. pp. 104–106. Mr. Norton (*Genuineness*, 1st edit. **2**, pp. 21, 22; abridged edit. p. 170) ascribes to Marcion a belief, in common with Valentinians, in a Pleroma. This is an error. Its correction does not impair, and might be regarded as slightly strengthening, his main argument. The super-terrestrial system of Marcion was entirely unlike that of the Valentinians.

[6] Compare Underworld Mission, Appendix, Note C. The term "Pleroma" was probably given to the supposed sphere or heaven of the fixed stars, because all within it was thought to be full of the material universe and of God; while beyond it was a measureless void. See Cicero, *De Repub.* **6**, 10; *Somn. Scip.* 4; *Opp. Philos.* **5**, pp. 379, 410. Also Diog. Laert. *Zeno*, 70; edit. Hnebner, **2**, p. 180; Bohn's trans. p. 310. Cicero copies evidently from Stoic or monotheistic sources. The Valentinian *Ogdoad* of Æons (cp. note 52) was mentally connected no doubt with their *Ogdoad* (Middle Space) dwelling-place. Cp. *Und. Mission*, p. 124.

[7] For Marcion's view, see *Underworld Mission*, pp. 118, 119, 127;

The Marcionites were ascetics, even to the renunciation of marriage.[8] The Valentinians aimed extravagantly at æsthetics and spiritualism. Their appreciation of the affections is shown by their regarding a man as to be pitied who could pass through life without loving and marrying some woman.[9]

Marcionites met torture or death, for their faith, as unflinchingly as other Christians.[10] The Valentinians are said to have been less faithful in this particular.

Valentinians regarded mankind as divisible, according to their separate natures, into three classes. These were, firstly, the material;[11] secondly, the ψυχικοί, that is, the

---

3d edit. pp. 113, 114, 121, 122. For that of the Valentinians, see the same work, pp. 24–27, 128, 129; 3d edit. pp. 23–26, 122–124.

[8] Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* **5**, 7; *Opp.* p. 588, C. Cp. Iren. **1**, 28, 1; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* **3**, 12. Their abstinence from life's real, or supposed, enjoyments was not connected, like asceticism of later date, with abstinence from industry.

[9] The Valentinians deem a man "degenerate *nec legitimum veritatis*, and not a legitimate Christian, who, having lived in the world, shall not have loved a woman nor united her to himself."—**Tertull.** *Adv. Valentin.* 30; *Opp.* p. 301 D.

[10] Mr. Norton (*Genuineness*, 1st edit. **2**, pp. 122, 123; abridged edit. pp. 225, 226) has cited testimony to Marcionite fidelity and to that of some among Valentinians. The *Letter from the churches at Lyons and Vienne*, in Gaul, contains mention of a Marcionite martyrdom which I do not remember to have seen noticed in modern histories. "Blandina was again brought in with a Marcionite (literally 'with a Pontian') boy about fifteen years old. These were daily brought in to see the suffering of the others, and efforts were made to compel their swearing by heathen idols. . . . The Marcionite, . . . nobly enduring every suffering, gave up the spirit."—**Euseb.** *Ecc. Hist.* **5**, 1; edit. Heinichen, Vol. **2**, pp. 30–32. If the letter be, as I should judge, from semi-Jewish Christians, it came from those who, as a class, were not overprone to praise Marcionites.

[11] Mr. Norton's abstract of Valentinian views on this subject will be found in his work, Vol. **2**, p. 160, 1st edit. As Irenæus states (*Adv. Hæres.* **1**, 5, 5), that the material man was formed, not from earth, but from ὕλη, or chaotic matter, it is possible that their term for this class was intended to include men of "chaotic" behavior and violent temper, equally as the grovelling.

merely rational, or "matter-of-fact," persons; and thirdly, the spiritual. Marcion made no such distinction, and would seem to have regarded all men as brethren.

Valentinians held, in common with other Alexandrine heretical and non-heretical Christians, that certain truths should be reserved for the enlightened. Marcion, on the other hand, exceeded the liberality of all other Christians in admitting Catechumens, or mere learners, to all his teachings and services.[12]

Men could hardly have been more unlike, as regards mental predispositions, than the followers of Marcion and Valentinus. On the latter, compare note 52.

Basilides and his followers, who, to simplify the argument, have not previously been mentioned, were another Alexandrine sect, resulting from this war, equally extravagant as the Valentinians, and who discriminated between the Jewish God and the Supreme Being. A full account of the Gnostics would occupy more space than can here be given it. The reader can consult Norton, "Genuineness of the Gospels," Vols. **2, 3**; in the abridged edition, pp. 160–413. The abridgment has an index, which the complete edition as yet needs. Some views of the Valentinian, or Alexandrine, Gnostics will be found in *Underworld Mission*, pp. 19–27, 128–131; 3d edit. pp. 18–26, 122–125.

2. HEATHEN NAMES AFFIXED TO JEWISH DOCUMENTS.

We now come to a second result of the revolt. In order to understand it we must remember that Christians, in controversy with heathens, could not appeal to their own documents as evidence; that this debarred them

[12] The non-heretical Christians of the second century admitted new converts only to a portion of their services. When they came to what were considered its holier prayers and services, new converts were dismissed. Marcion, on the contrary (Jerome, *Comment. in Galat.* **6**, 6; *Opp.* 7, col. 523; Tertull. *De Præscript. Hæret.* 41), was glad to have them listen to every teaching and share in every prayer. By the remark in the text must not be understood that the Valentinians were disciplinarians.

from using the Gospels, or any of what we call the New Testament writings, and prompted a free use of any authority recognized by heathens.

Monotheistic and moral verses were in circulation under the name of Sibylla, or without professed authorship. If these were to be used, it was desirable, during the storm of anti-Jewish feeling, to rescue them from suspicion of being Jewish. Even the established reputation of the verses from Erythræ did not save them from the same need.

A consequence of the foregoing state of things was that the verses from Erythræ, in spite of internal evidence to the contrary, were attributed to a daughter of Berosus,[13] the writer of Chaldæan history, while to various fragments were prefixed the names of different heathen Greeks. A few of these will enable the reader to judge how irreconcilable they were with a heathen authorship. "Hear **Sophocles** speaking as follows: —

> "One truly, but One is God,
> Who made heaven and the broad earth,
> The sea's sparkling billow and the violence of winds.
> But many [of us] mortals, deceived in heart,
> Established as refuge for misfortunes,
> Stone and wooden images of gods;
> Or their medals in gold and ivory.
> Making sacrifices and festal gatherings for these
> We deem it practical recognition [of the divine nature]."[14]

Another piece, of which the first seven lines may, or may not, be a Christian fabrication, is the following: —

"It is necessary to remind you what things **Orpheus** — the earliest teacher, as one may say, of your polytheism — eventually proclaims concerning one sole God, to his son Musæus and his other relatives. He said thus: —

> *"I speak to lawful listeners. Shut your doors, ye profane*
> *All together. Listen, Musæus, descendant of the*

---

[13] **Cohortatio ad Græcos**, 37; Just. Mart. *Opp.* **1**, p. 104, edit. Otto.

[14] **Cohortatio ad Græcos**, 18; Just. Mart. *Opp.* **1**, pp. 56–58, edit. Otto. The passage is found also in the treatise **De Monarchia**, 2; Justin, *Opp.* p. 114; and in **Clem. Alex.** *Protrept.* § 74, p. 63, edit. Potter, and its first two lines in **Athenagoras**, *Legat.* 5.

Brilliant moon. For I speak truth, lest [my ?] former
Views should rob you of longed-for eternity.
Looking to the divine teaching, λόγον, give it heed,
Guiding [your] heart's intelligent recess. Mount in earnest
The path without turn. Look to the Only King of the world.
One is self-born. By One are created all things which have origin.
He exists in them, nor does any mortal vision
Perceive him ; but he sees all.
He, besides good, sends evil to mortals,
Both bloody war and lamentable sufferings.
Nor is there another [ruler] save the Great King.
I do not see him, because a cloud is fixed about him ;
Because [also] all mortals have [but] mortal pupils in their eyes,
Which are weak to discern the all-pervading Guardian.
He fixes himself in the brazen heaven
On a golden throne. His feet touch the earth.[15]
He has stretched his right hand to the ocean's extremity
Everywhere ; for the mountain ridges tremble,
And the rivers, and the depth of the joyous foaming sea."[16]

The treatise De Monarchia commences its quotations with the following: "**Æschylus** first, when arranging his compositions, uttered his voice concerning the sole God. He spoke thus :—

"Distinguish God from mortals, and do not think
That the fleshly is like unto him.
You know him not. Sometimes he appears as fire,
Unapproachable in its rush, sometimes as water, sometimes as darkness.
He is present in [the scourge by] wild beasts,
In the wind, cloud and lightning, thunder [and] rain.
The sea is his servant, and the rocks,

---

[15] An imitation of **Isaiah 66**, 1 : "Heaven is my throne," etc.

[16] **Cohort. ad Græcos, 15.** The De Monarchia, **2**, omits the first two lines and Clem. Alex *Protrept.* § 74, the last eleven. To parry distrust of its professed authorship the passage must before the fourth century have been interpolated into a work of Aristobulus, a Jew (B. C. 180 ?) as if quoted by him from Orpheus. See Eusebius, *Præparat.* **13**, 12.

In the sixth line from the end of the above, I have adopted the reading τὸν διά. The other reading, adopted by Otto, Δία τόν, which makes Jupiter the person indicated, may either have originated with some Stoic, or with some Christian, willing to sacrifice consistency in order to create confidence in the heathen origin of his quotation. Compare note 40.

And every fountain, and the gatherings of water.
The mountains tremble, and the earth; both the monstrous
Depths of the sea and the great mountain heights,
When the Master's eye looks severe.
For the decision of the Highest God determines all things."[17]

Further on, the same work alleges that "**Philemon** . . . writes thus:—

"Tell me what we are to think of God,
Who sees all things and is himself invisible."[18]

Clement of Alexandria attributes the same passage to **Euripides.**

We will add one which teaches retribution and is from the treatise De Monarchia: "**Philemon** again says:—

"Do you think, O Nicostratus, that the dead,
After luxuriating during life,
Are concealed by the earth, so that from [now] to eternity
They escape the divine power by concealment?
There is an eye of retribution which sees all things.
For, if the JUST and GODLESS have one fate,
Haste to rob, steal, despoil, and embroil.
Be not deceived. There is judgment even in the Underworld,
Which God the Master of all will administer,
Whose fearful name I may not utter."[19]

Clement of Alexandria attributes the foregoing with additional matter to **Diphilus.**

The next on our list pertains to sacrifices. The treatise De Monarchia attributes it to **Philemon,** but Clement of Alexandria attributes it, or rather a portion of it, to **Menander.** It is here quoted from the former. "Philemon, again, testifies to me that God is not propitiated by the libation and sacrifice of evil-doers, but apportions, in rectitude, punishments to each. [He says]:—

"If any one, Pamphilus, by offering as sacrifice
A multitude of bulls or kids; or fabrications made

---

[17] **De Monarchia,** 2; Justin, *Opp.* **1,** pp. 112–114. Also in **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **5,** § 132, pp. 727, 728.

[18] **De Monarchia,** 2; Justin, *Opp.* **1,** pp. 114–116. Also in **Clem. Alex.** *Protrept.* § 68 (misnumbered 64 in Klotz), p. 59.

[19] **De Monarchia,** 3; Justin, *Opp.* **1,** pp. 118–120. Also in **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **5,** § 122, p. 721.

By others,[20]—[as] golden or purple cloaks,
Or carved work of ivory, or emerald,—
Thinks to make God well disposed,
He deceives himself and has a frivolous mind.
Man should make himself profitable,
Neither corrupting virgins nor married women.
Not stealing and killing for gain,
[Nor] looking with desire on another's,
Whether [on] his wife or costly house,
Or property, his man-servant, or simply his maid-servant,
[His] horses, oxen, or aggregate flocks.[21] What then?
You shall not, Pamphilus, desire one thread from his needle,
For God, who is near, sees thee,
Who is pleased with just, not with unjust, works.
He permits prosperity to the industrious [man],
Who tills the earth night and day.
Sacrifice to God, [by] observing constant justice.
Being resplendent not in clothes but in heart.
Do not fly at the sound of thunder,
O Master, if unconscious of wrong,
For God, who is near, sees thee."[22]

"**Pythagoras**," according to the De Monarchia, "participates with him [Orpheus] in what he [the former] writes [concerning monotheism]:—

"If any [being] save One shall say, 'I am God,' he ought,
Equally with this [One], after establishing a world, to say, 'This is mine.'
And not only, after establishing it, to say 'Mine,' but to dwell
In what he has made. He, however, has been made by this [One.]"[23]

Euripides is represented by the De Monarchia as teaching that the prosperously wicked should improve the time granted them before retribution.[24] Clement of Alexandria

---

[20] The translation follows the Codex Argentoratensis, omitting an oath by Jupiter, which, if not added by some Stoic, was inconsistently inserted by some Christian as confirming the heathen authorship of the piece. Compare note 16.

[21] Compare Exodus **20**, 17; and Deuteronomy **5**, 21.

[22] **De Monarchia**, 4; Justin, *Opp.* **1**, pp. 122–124. See also **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **5**, §§ 120, 121, pp. 720, 721.

[23] **De Monarchia**, 2; Justin. *Opp.* **1**, pp. 116–118, C.

[24] **De Monarchia**, 3, pp. 120–122, B. Also in **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **5**, § 122, pp. 721, 722.

attributes the same teaching, with some alteration of phraseology, to "**Diphilus** . . . the comic [poet]."

The De Monarchia makes two consecutive quotations, alleging them to be from **Menander.** One of these it claims to take from a work of his called the "CHARIOTEER." The quotation — but four lines long[25] — complains of any such god as goes about, instead of remaining at home. It might, save for the company in which we find it, be deemed a heathen production.

The second citation is seven lines long, and professedly from a work called "The Priestess," Ἱέρεια, or, as it might otherwise be translated, "The Sacrifice." One of its allegations is, that

> "If a man can sway
> Any god, by cymbals, to what he wishes,
> He who does this is greater than the god."[26]

An open attack of this kind upon heathen worship is less probably by a heathen than by a Jewish author.

Somewhat further on, another quotation is professedly made from a work called Diphilus, "Friend of God," which the writer attributes to **Menander.** It inculcates the honoring of one God.[27] **Clement of Alexandria** attributes the same to the comic poet, **Diphilus.**

The Cohortatio ad Græcos attributes to a heathen oracle a hymn concerning the Supreme Being, in the midst of which he was spoken of as

> "Having formed the first mortal and called him Adam."[28]

Theophilus attributes to "**Philemon,** the comic [poet]," the following: —

> "Those who recognize God have
> Good hopes of salvation."[29]

---

[25] **De Monarchia,** 5; **Clem. Alex.** *Protrept.* § 75. Justin (*Apol.* **1,** 20) attributes to Menander a belief in a conflagration.

[26] **De Monarchia,** 5; Justin. *Opp.* **1,** p. 126, B. C.; and in **Clem. Alex.** *Protrept.* § 75, *Opp.* pp. 64, 65.

[27] **De Monarchia,** 5; Justin. *Opp.* **1,** p. 132. Also in **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **5,** § 134, p. 728.

[28] **Cohortatio ad Græcos,** 38; Just. Mart. *Opp.* **6,** p. 108, D.

[29] **Theophilus,** *Ad Autol.* **3,** 7; Justin. *Opp.* ed. Maran, p. 385, A.

Compare in the Appendix, Note A, § VIII., two Jewish documents attributed to Phocylides.

If the question be asked, why these productions should be regarded as Jewish rather than Christian, the answer is, firstly, that, with the exception pointed out in the second quotation, they bear no marks of Christian peculiarities. This would scarcely have been the case had they been fabricated by Christians. Again, the fact that the Erythræan verses, unquestionably Jewish, are attributed at this date to a daughter of Berosus, favors the supposition that other Jewish documents would be treated in a similar manner. Further, we find God mentioned as having a name which was not to be uttered. This contradicts the view of Christians, that he had no name.[30] We find also the Underworld treated apparently as a place both of rewards and punishments. This is antagonistic to the view of Christians, who believed themselves exempt from it.[31]

3. The document called Acts of Pilate was an attempt to substitute non-Christian in place of Christian testimony for facts mentioned in the Gospels. Concerning events in Judæa, Jews were, naturally enough, in the original document, cited as witnesses. Some manuscripts, as elsewhere mentioned,[32] substitute Gentile monotheists instead of Jews. Absence of historical testimony forbids positive decision as to the cause or date of this change. The most probable explanation of it is the antagonism to Jews which resulted from this rebellion.

4. We now come to a fourth result of the war, an embitterment on the part of semi-Jewish Christians towards the Jews. In considering this, it is difficult to discriminate fully between the natural results of controversy and the additional embitterment occasioned by the war. The semi-Jewish Christians were those, of Gentile origin, most

---

[30] See, in *Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, note 5 on page 146.

[31] See *Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, §§ XXII., XXIII.

[32] See Appendix, Note B, foot-note 4.

nearly allied in faith to the Jews, in that they believed a fleshly resurrection, and, with perhaps some exceptions, a millennium and rebuilding of Jerusalem. They rejected any belief in the soul's ascent at death to heaven.[33] Their proximity, on many points, to the Jews, would account for their laying extra stress on points of difference. Yet this stress was obviously intensified by prevalent anti-Jewish feeling.

In order to appreciate their arguments against the Jews, a modern reader, in England, at least, and America, needs perhaps to be told that, in the second century, no Christians regarded Sunday as the Sabbath, and few, if any, kept it as a day of rest. The Sabbath was deemed by them a temporary institution for the Jews. They, however, not only deemed themselves exempt from its observance, but some of them treated the Jews as foolish for keeping it.[34]

In portions of the East, where the war raged less or did not extend, there seems to have been less depreciation of, and discourtesy towards, Jewish institutions. There Christians in their prayers stood erect on Saturday equally as on Sunday, — a mark of respect for the day wherewith some Western Christians found fault.[35]

---

[33] Compare *Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, pp. 8, 121, 162–167; 3d edit. pp. 7, 8, 116, 156–161.

[34] "The law given in Horeb is now antiquated, and concerned only you [Jews]." — **Just. Mart.** *Dialogue*, 11; *Opp.* **2**, p. 40 B. "Observe that the material universe, στοιχεῖα, is neither idle nor observes any Sabbath. Remain as you were born. For if before Abraham there was no need of circumcision, nor before Moses of Sabbath-keeping and feasts and offerings, neither is there now." — **Just. Mart.** *Dialogue*, 23; *Opp.* **2**, p. 78 B. "It has been shown that these things were commanded you because of your people's hardness of heart." — **Just. Mart.** *Dialogue*, 43; *Opp.* **2**, p. 136 D.

[35] **Rheinwald**, in his *Archæology*, § 62, treats the above-mentioned manifestation of honor towards the Saturday as a peculiarity of the whole Oriental Church. He says: "The custom of celebrating the old Jewish sabbath equally as Sunday, of abstaining, on it, from fasting, and of standing while praying, probably passed from the community of Jewish Christians into the Oriental Church. In the West, on the other hand,

§ II. *Indirect Effects.*

1. EXTRAVAGANT USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Among indirect results of the war was an increased extravagance on the part of Christians in using the Old Testament. A motive for its undue use had previously existed. Christians were tempted to fabricate from it evidences concerning Jesus, because the evidence in the Gospels rested on Christian testimony, and was therefore inadmissible in controversy against heathens or Jews. To this existing tendency the rise of the Gnostics gave a strong additional impulse. Their allegation, that Christ came not from the God of the Jews, made the Catholic or main body of Christians more bent on finding him constantly pointed out in the Old Testament. The ex-

---

especially in the anti-Jewish Roman Church, the Sabbath was distinguished as a fast. Already at an early day this matter was a subject of strife in the church, which became more violent after the middle of the fourth century. When, at last, fasting on the Sabbath was legalized [by a decree] from Rome, this difference furnished in later centuries one of the grounds of church separation between East and West."

Rheinwald, in coming to his conclusions, relies on certain documents (the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons) as representing customs of the Oriental Christians. This may be, in the main, correct. But the inference would be unsafe, that, in Judæa, or in the theatre of war anywhere, this mark of respect had been commonly shown, after the war, to the Jewish Sabbath by Gentile Christians. Access to Jerusalem was by Hadrian's edict prohibited to Jews. Marks of respect towards Judaism were not likely to be manifested, or tolerated, within it. Christians throughout Judæa had suffered severely at the hands of Bar-Cochba, the Jewish leader. They were not likely, in return for it, to manifest regard towards Jewish customs. Outside of Judæa, the undefined limits of the war foil effort to discriminate accurately between localities in which respect for Judaism remained, or was but temporarily impaired, and those in which it was supplanted by hatred.

Tertullian, before becoming a Montanist, found fault with such as observed the Sabbath after the Eastern fashion. When he had himself become a Montanist he imitated them. Citations from him and other authors may be found in notes which Rheinwald has appended to his § 62.

travagance of the earlier Fathers in this direction is well known. I append, however, a passage concerning Justin Martyr,[36] — who lived through the war and in the time of

[36] **Justin Martyr** "considers the tree of life planted in Paradise a symbol of Christ's cross, through which he achieved his triumphs; and he goes on to descant at great length on the symbolic properties of wood. Moses, he tells us, was sent with a rod to deliver his people; with a rod he divided the sea, and brought water out of the rock. By a piece of wood the waters of Marah were made sweet. With a rod, or staff, Jacob passed over the Jordan. Aaron obtained his priesthood by the budding and blossoming of his rod; Isaiah predicted that there should come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse; and David compares the just to a tree planted by the waters. From a tree, God was seen by Abraham; as it is written, 'at the oak of Mamre.' By a rod and staff, David, says he, received consolation of God. The people, having crossed the Jordan, found seventy willows; and, by casting wood into it, Elisha made iron to swim. In a similar strain he proceeds; which furnishes no unapt occasion for the sarcastic Middleton to say, that he 'applies all the sticks and pieces of wood in the Old Testament to the cross of Christ.' . . . God, he observes to Trypho, teaching us the mystery of the cross, says, in the blessing with which he blesses Joseph, 'The horns of a unicorn are his, and with them shall he push the nations to the end of the earth.' Now, the horns of the unicorn, he continues, exhibit, as it can be demonstrated, no other figure than that of a cross; and this he attempts to show by a very minute analysis. Then as to the assertion, 'With them shall he push the nations to the extremities of the earth'; this is no more than what is now taking place among all people; for, struck by the horn, that is, penetrated by the mystery of the cross, they, of all nations, are turned from idols and demons to the worship of God.

"Again: when the people warred with Amalek, and Jesus (Joshua), the son of Nun, led the battle, Moses, he says, prayed with his arms extended in the form of a cross; and if they were at any time lowered, so as to destroy this figure, the tide turned against the Israelites; but, as long as this figure was preserved, they prevailed. They finally conquered, he gravely remarks, not because Moses prayed, but because, while the name of Jesus was in the van of the battle, the former, standing or sitting with his arms extended, exhibited the figure of a cross. His sitting or bent posture, too, he observes, was expressive; and thus the knee is bent, or the body prostrated, in all effectual prayer. Lastly, the rock on which he sat had, says he, 'as I have shown,' a symbolic reference to Christ." — **Lamson**, *Church of the First Three Centuries*, pp. 46–48.

the Gnostics, — and also a specimen of the artistic skill wherewith Origen allegorized the Old Testament so as to connect it with the Gospel history.[37]

A reader unfamiliar with Greek may need to know that in that language Joshua and Jesus are one and the same name. Without this, a portion of Justin's argument would be unintelligible.

[37] "In Exodus **15**, 23–27, it is related that the Israelites, after crossing the Red Sea, came to the waters of Marah, which were so bitter that they could not drink them; but that the Lord showed Moses a tree, which when he cast into the water, it became sweet; and that afterwards the Israelites arrived at Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees.

"'It is very strange,' says **Origen**, 'that God should show Moses a tree to cast into the water, to make it sweet. Could he not make the water sweet without a tree? . . . But let us see what beauty there is in the inner sense.' He accordingly explains, that, allegorically understood, the bitter waters of Marah denote the Jewish Law, which, in its literal purport, is bitter enough; so that of its bitterness the true people of God cannot drink. 'What, then, is the tree which God showed to Moses? **Solomon** teaches us, when he says of *Wisdom*, that *she is a tree of life to all who embrace her*. If, therefore, the tree of wisdom, Christ, be cast into the Law,' and show us how it ought to be understood (I compress several clauses into these words), 'then the water of Marah becomes sweet, and the bitterness of the Law is changed into the sweetness of spiritual intelligence; and then the people of God can drink of it.' Origen afterwards remarks on the subsequent arrival of the Israelites at Elim with its twelve springs and seventy palm-trees. 'Do you think,' he asks, 'that any reason can be given why they were not first led to Elim? . . . If we follow the history alone, it does not much edify us to know where they first went, and where they next went. But, if we search out the mystery hidden in these things, we find the order of faith. The people is first led to the letter of the Law, from which, while this retains its bitterness, it cannot depart. But when the Law is made sweet by the tree of life, and begins to be spiritually understood, then the people passes from the Old Testament to the New, and comes to the twelve fountains of the Apostles. In the same place, also, are found seventy palm-trees. For not only the twelve Apostles preached faith in Christ, but it is related that seventy others were sent to preach the word of God, through whom the world might acknowledge the palms of the victory of Christ.' *Homil. in Exod.* **7**, §§ 1, 3; *Opp.* **2**, 151, 152." — **Norton**, *Genuineness*, **2**, pp. 256, 257, edit. 1844; abridged edition, pp. 305, 306.

The tendency of the Christians in this direction was counteracted in the latter half of the third century by heathen incredulity and ridicule, the result of Christian extravagance and of causes narrated below.[38] Arnobius

[38] Already, in the earlier part of the second century, some Christian had noted on the margin, or interpolated into the text, of the Old Testament two or three lines concerning the supposed Underworld Mission of Jesus. The various forms in which this interpolation appears are mentioned in *Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, p. 39; 3d edit. pp. 37, 38. On page 75 (3d edit. pp. 71, 72) of the same work will be found a quotation by Tertullian from Psalm **96**, 10, or **97**, 1, which, unless his memory failed him, would imply an interpolation, intentional or unintentional, of two or three words. The use made by Christians of one, or both, of these passages had, it would seem, created a distrust of their quotations. The author of the **Cohortatio ad Græcos**, when proposing to argue from the Old Testament, tells the heathens, "The preservation until now among the Jews of books which so uphold our [the Christian] monotheism, was a work of divine providence in our behalf; for, lest by bringing them from OUR [place of] assembly, we should afford to those who wish to calumniate us a pretence for [charging] fraud, we decide to bring them from the synagogue of the Jews." — Ch. 13, p. 48, edit. Otto.

In the first half of the third century a small work, called the Ascension of Isaiah, was forged. Its teachings cannot have been acceptable to the Gnostics nor to the semi-Jewish party among Catholics, nor to any save an exceptional few among the Liberalist Catholics. Yet, however small its circulation, it could not but add somewhat to the prevailing distrust of professedly Jewish records when used by Christians.

In the second half of the third century lived Porphyry, an opponent of Christianity, who had read much, who was widely known, and who enjoyed a reputation at least for ability. He wrote a work in fifteen books against the Christians. **Jerome**, in his preface to Daniel (Vol. **5**, col. 617, 618), says that "Porphyry wrote his twelfth book against the Prophet Daniel, maintaining that it was not composed by him whose name it bears, but by some one in Judæa during the time of Antiochus, surnamed Epiphanes, and that Daniel narrated not so much future events as past ones." To a chronologist the assigned date would imply that the book was anterior to Christianity. But the mass of the community and a large share even of intelligent persons, at that date, were quite ignorant of chronology. Christianity was more than two centuries old, and the vagueness of their knowledge concerning things which belonged even a

uses no argument from the Old Testament.[39] Lactantius, though a semi-Jewish Christian, forbears such argument in the earlier part of his work, and maintains that it is not advisable with heathens.[40]

---

century before themselves, would have made them take small account of inconsistencies in date, especially when this absence of discrimination favored their own prejudices. The work of Porphyry probably assisted in bringing distrust of Christian quotations from the Old Testament to that culmination which is evinced by a citation from Lactantius in our next note but one.

[39] The article on Arnobius in **Smith's** Dictionary says, "The Old Testament seems to have been altogether unknown to him." Some writers have, on this account perhaps, deemed him only a Catechumen — not yet admitted to full communion with Christians — when he wrote. The latter error is partly due to an interpolation of Jerome's Chronicon. The interpolator, it may be remarked, placed the work of Arnobius twenty or thirty years too late, — a mistake not likely to have been made by Jerome.

[40] **Lactantius** mentions in the earlier portion of his work that the Prophetical writings were discredited as uninspired, and in a later passage asserts that they were deemed RECENT forgeries. In his *Institutes*, **1**, 4, he says, "Persons devoid of the truth do not think that these [Prophetical writings] can be trusted; for they say they were not divine but human utterances." And in ch. 5, he continues: "But let us omit the testimonies of the prophets, lest the proof should seem less appropriate from these [writers] to whom no credence whatever is attached." In the same work (**4**, 5), he remarks: "Before I begin concerning God and his works, I must say a few things concerning the prophets whose testimony it is now necessary to use." Then, after an argument for their antiquity, he continues, in the same chapter: "The prophets, therefore, are found to be more ancient than even the Greek writers. All which things I adduce in order that they may perceive their error who strive to convict the Scripture as of late origin and recently forged." Further on, in the same work (**5**, 4), he finds fault with Cyprian for having argued against the heathen Demetrianus from the Old Testament: "For he was not to be refuted by the testimonies of Scripture, which he regarded as idle, [or] forged, [or] spurious, but by arguments and reasoning." Lactantius, in the foregoing, uses the term "Scripture" in its then usual sense as designating only the Old Testament. Cyprian, in the work alluded to, had made but one citation (Rom. **12**, 19) from the New Testament, and he probably thought, in making it, that he was quoting from

2. ANTITHESES OF IRENÆUS.

Another indirect result of the war was closely allied with the former one. It is noticeable for its singularity rather than for its importance, since but one writer has given it prominence. Irenæus assumes that events recorded in the Old Testament are, to a great extent, antithetically repeated in the Christian dispensation. Illustrations of his peculiarity have been given in another work,[41] and are, therefore, omitted here. He thought, probably, that this repetition implied a direct connection between the two systems, and thus refuted Gnosticism. If the repetition, moreover, were antithetical, the prevalent feeling against Judaism could be met by the question, why not take its antithesis.

3. JESUS DEIFIED AS SUBORDINATE GOD OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.[41a]

Yet another indirect result of the war has lasted, though in an altered form, until the present day. The Gnostics, as we have seen, maintained that the God of the Old Testament could not be the Supreme Being. There was much in the Jewish Scriptures, which, if regarded as a literal and reliable record of events, seemed irreconcilable with the attributes of such a Being. These passages, brought into prominence by the Gnostics, had to be explained, not to persons brought up with a devout reverence for the Old Testament, but to heathens who were willing enough to ridicule it. Placed in this dilemma, a portion of the Christian controversialists took apparently an idea from Exodus **23**, 20, 21, 23, where the Deity is represented as saying of his messenger, who should lead the Israelites into Canaan, "MY NAME SHALL BE UPON HIM." The messenger's name was Joshua, the same in the original as Jesus. Starting from this and assuming, rather than

---

the Old. Compare Deuteronomy **32**, 35, 41, 43, with Paul's phraseology. Cyprian should not, however, be judged by the criticism of Lactantius.

[41] See *Underworld Mission*, pp. 71–74, 94 ; 3d edit. pp. 67–71, 89, 90.

[41a] Compare *Indirect Testimony*, Appendix, Note M.

admitting, that much which was narrated could not be understood of the Supreme Being,[42] they alleged an idea nowhere even hinted in the New Testament, that the God who had appeared to the Patriarchs and spoken with Moses, was a subordinate being and was none other than Jesus in a pre-existent state.[43]

---

[42] "Justin, among many other similar proofs, that there is another god beside the Supreme God, quotes those passages in which it is said, that God ascended from Abraham; that God spoke to Moses; that the Lord came down to see the tower of Babel which the sons of men had built; and that God shut the door of the ark after Noah had entered. 'Do not suppose,' he says (*Dialog.* 127), 'that the unoriginated God either descended or ascended; for the ineffable Father and Lord of All neither comes anywhere, nor walks, nor sleeps, nor arises; but remains in his own place, wherever that may be.' After describing the greatness, omniscience, and omnipresence of the Supreme God, he proceeds: 'How, then, can he speak to any one, or be seen by any one, or appear in a little portion of the earth, when the people could not behold on Sinai even the glory of him whom he sent? . . . Neither Abraham, therefore, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man, ever saw the Father, the ineffable Lord of All, even of Christ himself; but they saw him who, through the will of the Father, was a god, his Son, and likewise his angel, as ministering to his purposes.'" — **Norton**, *Genuineness*, **2**, pp. 248, 249; abridged edit. 300, 301.

Tertullian says to the Jews: "For he who spoke to Moses was himself the Son of God, [the same] who always appeared; for no one ever saw God the Father and lived. Therefore it is certain that it was the Son, himself, of God who spoke to Moses and said to The People, '*Lo, I send my messenger before thy face* — that is, [the face] of The People — who shall guard thee in the way and introduce thee into the land which I have prepared for thee. Attend to him . . . for my name is upon him.'" — Tertull. *Adv. Judæos*, **9**, pp. 218 D, 219 A, edit. Rigault.

[43] "In his Dialogue with Trypho [c. 56], **Justin Martyr** says, 'I will endeavor to prove to you from the Scriptures, that he who is said to have appeared to Abraham, to Jacob, and to Moses, and is called God, is another god [that is, divine being], different from God who created all things, another, I say, numerically, not in will, for I affirm, that he never did anything at any time, but what it was the will of him who created the world, and above whom there is no other God, that he should do and say.'" — **Norton**, *Genuineness*, **2**, p. 248; abridged edit. p. 300.

"Tertullian regarded the Son, or the Logos, as having been the min-

Justin distinguishes in more than one form of phraseology between the Supreme Being and the pre-existent

---

ister of God in creation and in all his subsequent works. To him he ascribes whatever actions are ascribed to God in the Old Testament. 'He always descended to converse with men, from the time of Adam to that of the patriarchs and prophets.' 'He who was to assume a human body and soul was even then acquainted with human affections; asking Adam, as if ignorant, Where art thou, Adam? repenting of having made man, as if wanting prescience; putting Abraham to trial, as if ignorant of what was in man; offended and reconciled with the same individuals; and so it is with regard to all which the heretics [the Gnostics] seize upon to object to the Creator, as unworthy of God, they being ignorant that those things were suitable to the Son, who was about to submit to human affections, to thirst, hunger, and tears, and even to be born and to die. . . . How can it be that God, the Omnipotent, the Invisible, whom *no man hath seen or can see, who dwells in light inaccessible*, walked in the evening in paradise, seeking Adam, and shut the door of the ark after Noah had entered, and cooled himself under an oak with Abraham, and called to Moses from a burning bush? . . . These things would not be credible concerning the Son of God, if they were not written; perhaps they would not be credible concerning the Father, if they were.'" — **Norton**, *Genuineness*, **2**, pp. 249, 250; abridged edit. pp. 301, 302. The citation is from **Tertull.** *Adv. Prax.* 16.

Mr. Norton, in another part of his work, states, without translating, the substance of a passage in Origen: "Origen says, that the distinction made by the heretics in affirming that the Creator is just, and the Father of Christ good, may, in his opinion, when accurately understood, be said of the Father and the Son. The Son is just; he has received authority to judge the world righteously. Men are here prepared by the various discipline which he appoints in justice for the time when he will deliver up his kingdom, when God, being all in all, will display his goodness toward those who have been disciplined by his Son; and perhaps *all* things, Origen adds, may be thus prepared for its reception. Christ himself has said that the Father alone is good. In like manner, Origen thinks that a true sense may be given to the proposition, that there is one superior to the Creator, Christ being regarded as the Creator; for the Father is greater than he." — *Genuineness*, **3**, pp. 39, 40. The passage restated is from the Commentary of **Origen** on John **1**, § 40; *Opp.* **4**, p. 41, edit. De la Rue; *Opp.* **1**, p. 78, edit. Lommatzsch.

To the foregoing citations by Mr. Norton many others might be added. **Justin** says: "Of which things [that you regard as not proved] I will

Jesus. The former is devoid of name because needing none.[44] The latter has a name. The former alone is ἀγέννητος, unborn.[45] The latter owed his existence to the Father. The former is ἄῤῥητος, unspoken, not to be conversed with.[46] The latter conversed with Moses from a bush. The former is the "Maker of all things."[47] To the latter, whatever his alleged agency in the creation, **Justin** does not apply this title. The former is ἄφθαρτος, imperishable.[48] The latter owed his preservation to his Father.[49] The latter was a god προσκυνητός, to be hom-

---

endeavor to convince you, seeing that you are conversant with the Scriptures, [namely,] that there is and [that there] is mentioned [in Scripture] another God and Lord, ὑπό, subordinate to the Maker of all things, who is also called angel [i. e. messenger] because of his announcing to men whatever the Maker of all things — above whom there is no other god — wishes to announce." — *Dialogue*, 56; *Opp.* **2**, p. 178, edit. Otto. And again: "I will show, O Trypho, that . . . only this very person — called an angel, but being in reality a god — was seen by, and conversed with, Moses." — *Dialogue*, 60; *Opp.* **2**, p. 200, edit. Otto. See also other passages of the *Dialogue*, in Otto's edition of the *Opp.* **2**, pp. 180, 420, 422, 424, 426, 428, and an extract from Justin's first Apology in *Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, Appendix, Note A. Cp. *Ind. Testimony*, pp. 190, 191.

[44] See, in *Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, note 5, on p. 146.

[45] *Apol.* **1**, 14, 49; **2**, 12, 13; *Opp.* **1**, pp. 164 B, 234 B, 310 C, 312 D; *Dialogue*, 5, 114, 126, 127; *Opp.* **2**, pp. 28 D, 380 A, 420 D, 422 E, edit. Otto. Compare Clem. Alex. *Strom.* **6**, 58.

[46] *Apol.* **2**, 10, 12, 13; *Opp.* **1**, pp. 306 A, 310 C, 312 D; *Dialogue*, 126, 127 twice; *Opp.* **2**, pp. 420 D, 422 E, 424 B. The term ἄῤῥητος, as used by Justin, is usually translated ineffable, unutterable, a sense which it has in the first *Apology*, 9, where applied, not to the Deity, but to his glory. If the meaning attached to it above be erroneous, it is none the less a mark of distinction, applied by Justin to the Father only. It does not, if the concordance of Trommius can be relied upon, occur in the Septuagint; nor do I remember to have found it applied, in the Sibylline Oracles, to the Deity.

[47] *Dialogue*, 11, 102, 116; *Opp.* **2**, pp. 38 E, 344 D, 386 C.

[48] "God alone is unborn and [inherently] imperishable, and on this very account is he God. All things [coming into existence] after him are born and [therefore] perishable." — **Justin**, *Dialogue*, 5; *Opp.* **2**, p. 28 D.

[49] "For if the Son of God be found to say, that he cannot be saved

aged.[50] Justin, in common with other Christians, probably applied the term σέβειν — meaning to deify, or recognize as God — solely to the former.[51]

Any distinct personification of the holy spirit, unless among Alexandrine Gnostics,[52] seems to have begun in the

---

either by his sonship, or strength, or wisdom, but though sinless . . . he could not be saved without God, how do not you and others, expecting salvation without this hope, reason so as to deceive yourselves." — **Justin**, *Dialogue*, 102; *Opp.* **2**, p. 344. The remarks are based on Psalm **22**, 11 (Septuagint, **21**, 11), which Psalm the Fathers put into the mouth of Jesus, because of his quoting on the cross its first verse.

[50] "These [passages of the Old Testament] show expressly that Christ should be capable of suffering and προσκυνητὸν θεόν, a god to be homaged." — *Dialogue*, 68; *Opp.* **2**, p. 232 C. "Who is this that is called . . . by David *Anointed*, and *god to be homaged?*" — *Dialogue*, 126, p. 418 C. This remark of Justin is based on the Greek of Psalm **72**, 11 (Septuagint, **71**, 11), and **45**, 12 (Septuagint, **44**, 13). Moses "said thus: . . . *Let all the angels of God do him homage.*" — *Dialogue*, 130; *Opp.* **2**, p. 430 C. The citation is from Deuteronomy **32**, 43. We Christians "do homage to, and love the Logos of the Unborn and unspoken (or ineffable) God, μετὰ τὸν θεόν, [next] after God himself." — *Apol.* **2**, 13; *Opp.* **1**, p. 312 D. Compare *Apol.* **1**, 49; *Dialogue*, 34, 37, 38, 52, 64, 78 (twice), 88; *Opp.* **1**, p. 232 E; **2**, pp. 112 E, 122 A, B, 126 C, 166 D, 214 B, 264 D, 268 E, 300 C. See also in the Appendix, Note B, § 1. No. 10.

[51] The verb σέβειν, as quoted from Justin in Note B of the Appendix, foot-note 40, is probably an instance of, rather than a departure from, ordinary Christian phraseology. There is another instance of its use in Justin which requires a supposition, though a natural one, to harmonize it with the idea that he, in common with most, if not all, Christians, restricted its use to the Supreme Being. The Gnostics regarded Jesus as superior to the Jewish Deity, and they, or some of them, may have designated their relations to him by the term σέβειν. Justin says, that "instead of deifying Jesus, ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸν Ἰησοῦν σέβειν, they confess him in name only." — *Dialogue*, 35; *Opp.* **2**, p. 116 E.

[52] The Alexandrine, or Theosophic, Gnostics, of whom the Valentinians were the chief representatives, personified many of the divine attributes, but it is difficult to say in how far they regarded these personifications as distinct beings. According to them the Supreme Being, whom — as a means of characterizing the depth of his nature — they called "The Deep," had dwelt from eternity with Thought, also called Favor and

early part of the third century. In the second century Justin, in his lengthy discussion with Trypho, merely endeavors to prove a second being who may be called God, but nowhere mentions nor discusses the existence of a third one. In addressing heathens he uses almost exclusively the term prophetic spirit,[53] instead of holy spirit.

Silence, as his spouse. From this union, between depth of nature and silent benevolent thought, sprung Intellect and, for his bride, Truth. From the union of Intellect and Truth originated the Logos (Reason, including perhaps creative power) and Life. From the union of Reason with Life originated Man and the Assembly. These constituted the first Ogdoad. See Irenæus, **1**, 1, 1, **1**, 8, 5; Norton, *Genuineness*, **3**, 113–130. Christ and the Holy Spirit were produced subsequently to not a few other æons. They did not belong to the first Ogdoad.

[53] Justin uses the term "PROPHETIC SPIRIT" in *Apology*, **1**, 6, 13, 31, 33 (twice), 35, 38, 39, 40 (twice), 42, 44 (twice), 47, 48, 51, 53 (55 ?), 60, 63 (twice); *Opp.* **1**, pp. 150 C, 164 E, 200 B, 206 E, 208 B, 210 A, 214 C, E, 216 D, 218 E (first), 220 B, 224 B, 226 B, 230 A, 232 D, 236 B, 242 B (248 D), 256 C, 264 B, C.

He once uses the term "holy PROPHETIC SPIRIT," *Apol.* **1**, 53; *Opp.* **1**, p. 242 D; and once the term "divine holy prophetic spirit," *Apol.* **1**, 32, p. 204 C; and twice the term "HOLY SPIRIT," *Apol.* **1**, 33, 67, pp. 208 B, 268 D; and once the term "DIVINE SPIRIT," *Apol.* **1**, 32, p. 204 B. If one or more passages have been overlooked in making out the above list, they can scarcely diminish the prominence given in his *Apology* to the term "PROPHETIC SPIRIT."

Justin nowhere DISTINCTLY speaks of the spirit as a person. In two passages, he speaks of it in a manner which may be illustrated as follows: If a Christian should say that he reverenced God, Christ, and revelation, we should regard him as to some extent distinguishing revelation from its author and from the immediate agent through whom it was introduced; but no one would understand him as speaking of a third person, nor deem him inconsistent if he elsewhere treated it as an interposition of God, or as God manifesting himself more unmistakably to men. Justin regarded the prophetic spirit as a divine interposition in human affairs, and one to which mankind should bow with reverence. In this sense he uses it in *Apol.* **1**, 6, quoted in our Appendix, Note B, foot-note 40, and also, I think, in *Apol.* **1**, 13. Its location in order and rank after Christ may be because Justin regarded the prophetic spirit as a manifestation of the Logos in the Old dispensation, whilst he deemed Christ an embodiment of the same Logos in the New. Thus interpreted he does not utter a

Even in the third century and later the distinct personality and divinity of the holy spirit stood, with its few advocates, in the background, as compared with the deification of Christ, and is strikingly ignored by others.[54]

GLARING self-contradiction when, as we shall shortly see, he identifies it with the Logos.

If we wish to understand why Justin in addressing heathens uses the phrase "prophetic spirit" so exclusively and mentions the holy spirit but twice, — one instance being a quotation and the other a statement of Christian usage, — we must remember that heathens were familiar with the idea of a divine impulse which communicated foreknowledge. They contested or denied a divine influence for the moral enlightenment, or purification, of human beings. See Cicero, *De Nat. Deorum.* **3**, 36, quoted in Ch. II. note 3. In dealing with a Jew the case was different, and for the convenience of students I subjoin some references, incomplete, perhaps, to his use of the word "SPIRIT" in his *Dialogue.*

The term "PROPHETIC spirit" is used in the *Dialogue*, 38, 43, 53, 139; *Opp.* **2**, pp. 124 E, 138 A, 170 A, 454 B; being also put into the mouth of Trypho in c. 49, p. 160 B. The term "holy prophetic spirit" occurs cc. 32, 56, pp. 104 E, 178 D; and "divine spirit," c. 9, p. 36 D. The term "holy spirit" is found in cc. 29, 33, 36 (twice), 54, 56 (twice), 61, 88, 114, 124; *Opp.* **2**, pp. 94 C, 108 B, 120 D, 122 C, 172 E, 184 C, D, 202 B, 306 D, 378 C, 414 C. On Justin's theory that Jesus was the deity whose direct agency had been recorded in the Old Testament, it would seem that the prophetic or divine influence must have proceeded, not from the Supreme Being, but from his subordinate. He affirms (*Apol.* **1**, 55, p. 248 D), "This was spoken by a prophet [**Lam. 4**, 20]: '*The spirit in our presence is Christ the Lord.*'" Another passage (*Apol.* **1**, 38, p. 214 C) may have been intended to convey the same meaning, though it admits equally well a different one. But in *Apol.* **1**, 33, p. 208 B, C, he says, "By the spirit, therefore, and the power from God, we must understand nothing else than the Logos, who is God's first-born, as Moses — whom we have already shown to be a prophet — indicated."

Had Justin regarded the prophetic, or holy, spirit as a third deity, or a third person in the Deity, it is inconceivable that he should nowhere have distinctly stated, nor attempted to prove, a proposition so unknown to those whom he addressed. Otto thinks that Justin deemed the spirit a distinct existence as an ANGEL, or minister, of Jesus Christ. See his *Commentatio* on Justin, p. 138.

[54] The Philosophumena, or *Omnium Hæresium Refutatio*, a work of the third century, devotes four books to errors of philosophers; five more

In a former work I leaned to the opinion that the representation of Christ as special deity of the Old Testament had originated somewhat earlier than Justin's time.[55] This view and the Gnostic one concerning an inferior Deity who had appeared to the patriarchs and prophets, were so nearly related that, unless they had a common origin, ONE MUST HAVE GIVEN RISE TO THE OTHER. I was then ignorant, as other writers seem to have been, of any *immediate* cause for the rise of Gnosticism. I have now no doubt that it originated in the anti-Jewish feeling occasioned by the war under Hadrian, and, therefore, have no

---

to those of Christian heretics and Jews; and in the tenth book, after an epitome of philosophies and heresies, lays down (pp. 334 - 337) the true Christian faith which recognizes a second though subordinate God, but utterly ignores a third one. The same peculiarity may be found in the Epistle of Orthodox bishops against Paul of Samosata. Routh, *Reliq. Sac.* **3**, p. 291. Routh has collected in four volumes the fragments of early Christian writers, much of the space, however, being devoted to notes. If his Index, under the term "Spiritus Sanctus," be complete, there is in his fragments from the FIRST THREE CENTURIES (exclusive of his notes) no mention of the Holy Spirit as God, though there are two doxologies (**2**, p. 308; **3**, p. 515) in which the Holy Spirit is mentioned with the Father and the Son. The second of these instances would be difficult to reconcile with the personality of the Spirit, and the former does not imply it.

Had Syrian Christians believed the deity of Christ or of the Holy Spirit at the date when Pseudo-Thaddeus was written, it is incomprehensible that this apostle should have been represented in teaching a heathen monarch as ignoring the deity of either. Forrest (*Hist. of the Trinity*, Amer. edit. pp. 39, 40) gives citations from Origen and Eusebius, which, in discussing a second God, ignore a third one.

[55] From the above-mentioned work, published in 1854, the following is copied: "I am inclined to assign a somewhat earlier date than the age of Justin to this opinion, though my only reason for so doing is the strong suspicion that the Marcionite branch of Gnosticism was, to a considerable extent, but an offshoot from this identical view of the Catholics." — *Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, note on page 152; 3d edit. note 4, p. 146.

The foregoing left the rise of Alexandrine, or Theosophic, Gnosticism unexplained, or insufficiently explained, though on a single point that system evidently resembled the then incipient Catholic conception.

doubt that its discrimination between the Supreme Being and the God of the Old Testament led Catholics to discriminate in like manner. Their representation of Jesus as God of the Old Testament was but a consequence of the Gnostic view. This consequence was, and for a long time remained, distasteful to the mass of Christians, especially to Jewish ones. One, if not two, generations had passed away after the appearance of this doctrine when Tertullian, a Gentile Christian, addressing Gentile Christians, says, that the most of them cried out against it.[56] Touching extra aversion to it among Jewish Christians, Justin says, that they were less willing to receive it.[57] Origen says, that, without exception, they rejected it.[58]

---

[56] "All the simple, — not to call them inconsiderate or stupid, — who constitute always the majority of believers, *expavescunt*, are horrified at the ECONOMY. [The word means literally "household rule or law." Tertullian uses it to designate a family arrangement whereby the Father, as head of the family, had intrusted part of his duties to one or two others.] . . . They proclaim that two, AND ALREADY THREE, Gods are preached by us, but assume themselves to be worshippers of [the] one God. We, they say, hold 'THE MONARCHY.' . . . The Latins are studious, *sonare*, to emphasize [the word] 'MONARCHY.' The Greeks, even, are unwilling to understand the 'ECONOMY.'" — **Tertull.** *Adv. Prax.* 3. Tertullian defends himself in two, not very consistent, ways. He alleges (c. 3) that if the divine Monarchy is not impaired when administered through legions of angels, neither does it suffer when administered through the Son and Spirit. But in the next chapter he assumes that the MONARCHY, or sole rule, is temporarily intrusted to the Son. "How is it possible that I destroy from [Christian] belief the MONARCHY, which I retain in the Son, delivered to the Son by the Father? . . . We see, therefore, that the Son is no obstacle to the Monarchy, although to-day it is held by the Son in virtue of his office and will be restored with his office by the Son to the Father [after all things shall have been subjected to the Son]." — **Tertull.** *Adv. Prax.* 4.

The use by Tertullian's opponents of the word "ALREADY" implies that belief in a third God was a recent innovation, and that the introduction of a second one was yet fresh in their memories.

[57] "I know that this teaching seems paradoxical, and especially to those of your [the Jewish] race." — **Justin,** *Dialogue,* 48; *Opp.* **2,** p. 154 C. Compare note 60.

[58] "When you regard the faith, concerning the Saviour, of the Jews

This repugnance of Jews and Jewish Christians to, or horror at, hearing him, who had taught in their streets, represented as the God who had spoken to Moses, did not prevent the new view from being aided by a conception of Hellenistic Judaism. Some Hellenist Jews had strongly personified the Logos, or INTELLIGENT AGENCY of God in the universe.[59] Such Christian controversialists, of heathen origin, as inclined to, or adopted, the new view, treated the Logos as a DISTINCT PERSON and identified it with their subordinate deity of the Old Testament. The chief acceptance of the view was probably among CONTROVERSIALISTS of this class. Yet, even among these, the writer of the COHORTATIO AD GRÆCOS, in the second century, ignores it; the author of the CLEMENTINES, in emphatic language, condemns it;[60] and the DE MONARCHIA

---

who believe on Jesus, some regarding him as the son of Joseph and Mary, others of Mary and the Holy Spirit, but without any belief in his divine nature, you will comprehend how this blind man [Mark **10**, 46–48, whom Origen regarded as typifying Judaism] says, '*Son of David, take pity on me.*'" — **Origen**, in *Matt.* **16**, 12; *Opp.* **3**, p. 733 A.

[59] See Ch. III. notes 29, 30. In the book called the **Wisdom of Solomon**, a prayer begins as follows: —

> "God of [our] Fathers and Lord of compassion,
> Who hast formed all things by thy Logos
> And fashioned man by thy wisdom."
>
> Ch. **9**, 1, 2.

Elsewhere the same book alludes, as follows, to the destruction of the first-born in Egypt: —

> "Thy all-powerful Logos from the heavens,
> A destroying warrior from the regal seats,
> Leaped to the middle of the fated land
> Bearing as a sharp sword thy unambiguous decree,
> And coming to a stand, he filled all things with death.
> He touched heaven [with his head], but walked upon the earth."
>
> Ch. **18**, 15, 16.

In some cases PROVIDENCE — God's thoughtfulness put into exercise — would closely translate the *Jewish* use of Logos. In others FIAT, or as in the last citation, EXECUTIVE-ENERGY would be more appropriate. Compare Norton, *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 332–374. On gigantic stature attributed to heavenly beings compare pp. 259, 338.

[60] The Evil One "has contrived that those [Christians] from among

bears for a title the rallying cry of those who would not listen to it.[61]

CHAPTER XII.

CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE, A. D. 138 – 180.

§ 1. *A. D.* 138 – 161. *Antoninus Pius.*

The rebellion of the Jews under Hadrian terminated their influence in Europe, though not, perhaps, in Asia.[1] We will, however, superadd to the historical narrative an item or two of their condition under the Antonines. The elder of these emperors was a man of better judgment, apparently, than his successor. Good dispositioned him-

---

the Gentiles, who are giving up the divinity of images, should introduce belief in a plurality of other gods, that on their cessation from their κάτω debasing [*or* "earthly"] polytheistic madness, they may be misled to speak otherwise, or even worse, against the Sole-rulership, Μοναρχίας, of God, so that, not giving a chief place to this Sole-rulership, they may be unable to receive mercy." — *Hom.* **3**, 3. "Denial of Him is for a professed monotheist to allege until death another God, whether [as the Gnostics ?] a greater, or [as those who deify Jesus ?] a less." — *Hom.* **3**, 7. "Consider before all things that no one is joint ruler with him; no one participates in his name, on which [very] account he is called God. For he is not only called, but is, ALONE, and it is not lawful to think or mention another [as God], but if any one should dare [it] his soul will be perpetually punished." — *Hom.* **3**, 37. "Our Lord . . . did not proclaim himself God. . . . The Father is unborn, the Son is born; the born cannot compare with the unborn or self-born." — *Hom.* **16**, 15, 16. The work is sometimes called **Clementines**, sometimes **Clementine Homilies**.

[61] See Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.* 3, quoted in note 56.

[1] The respect shown in the second and third centuries by Eastern Christians to the Jewish sabbath (see Ch. XI. foot-note 35) renders probable that Jewish influence was not terminated in Asia. The Jews in that section cannot have been everywhere in open revolt. See the last paragraph of a quotation from Dio Cassius in Ch. X. foot-note 133.

self, he seems to have repressed harshness and extortion in others, and, though several times involved in war, to have cultivated amicable relations with foreign nations.[2] The Jewish rebellion, which he suppressed,[3] must probably, therefore, have been a remnant of the troubles under Hadrian, or else the act of a few, stimulated by local oppression or by some of the calamities which befell the Romans.[4]

§ II. *A. D.* 161–180. *Marcus Antoninus.*

Marcus, the second of the Antonines, had some good points in his character; but he was weak, and his prejudices in favor of old institutions[5] could not but bias his judgment in matters pertaining to Jews and Christians, while his love of approbation and his inability to say NO, must, not merely in religious, but in all administrative matters, have rendered him an easy prey to such as understood taking advantage of his foibles.[6] His prejudices

[2] Antoninus Pius, "appointing, as far as possible, to the administration of public affairs men who made most account of justice, conferred honor on good officials and removed the bad, without harshness, from public affairs. Not only, therefore, was he admired by his own countrymen, but by foreign nations, so that some of the neighboring barbarians, laying aside their arms, committed to the emperor's decisions the settling of their difficulties."—**Suidas**, Vol. **3**, p. 234; copied also in the Abridgment of **Dio Cass. 70**, 6; Vol. **4**, pp. 394–396.

[3] See Appendix, Note J, foot-note 14.

[4] "These adversities happened in his time. The famine, of which we have spoken; the destruction of the Circus; an earthquake, whereby cities at Rhodes and Asia were thrown down; . . . and a fire at Rome which destroyed four hundred blocks or houses."—**Capitolinus**, *Antonin. Pius*, 9; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 35. "Under Antoninus [Pius] a most frightful earthquake is said to have taken place in the regions of Bithynia and the Hellespont."—Abridgment of **Dio Cass. 70**, 4; Vol. **4**, p. 394.

[5] See Ch. II. note 41.

[6] The elder Antoninus had taken good care of the finances. He abolished the salaries of all idlers (*Script. Hist. August.* p. 33), husbanded his resources, and seems to have been constantly well supplied with funds. Marcus, on the contrary, when about to make war, sold the furniture and ornaments of his palace in order to provide means (Capitolinus, *Antonin.*

swayed him in retaining at the east a brutal commander[7] who found pleasure in annoying Jews and outraging their religious sentiments,[8] while his weakness made him permit barbarities at Rome which his judgment condemned, and against which, probably, his feelings revolted.[9]

In the writings of this emperor we can discover, what perhaps was equally true in the days of his predecessor, that Judaism at Rome, as an influence to be feared by conservatives, had been superseded by Christianity. The emperor's sneer is not directed at "Foreign Rites," but at Christians.[10] Conservatism, however, remained essentially

---

16; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 51). This might excite favorable comment, but was a poor substitute for public economy and careful supervision. Possibly the time which he devoted to public lecturing before his departure for the war might have been better spent in making thoughtful provision for his soldiers.

[7] Avidius Cassius "first invented that kind of punishment. He planted a pole one hundred and eighty feet high, . . . and from the top to the bottom bound those who were condemned, and set fire at the foot, so that he killed some who were burnt, others who were tortured by the smoke, and others by fear." — **Gallicanus,** *Avid. Cass.* 4; *Hist. August.* p. 71.

When this Cassius was in command on the Danube, an auxiliary force under direction of his centurions discovered a body of the enemy, off its guard, and defeated it. When they returned with high hopes to Cassius, he, instead of rewarding, crucified the centurions, an unheard-of procedure; see *Avid. Cass.* 4; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 72.

Concerning this savage, the emperor writes: "I have given the Syrian legions to Avidius Cassius, . . . for they cannot be governed save by ANCIENT discipline." — *Avid. Cass.* 5; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 73.

[8] Avidius Cassius "always inspected the arms of the soldiers on the seventh day, . . . the exercise of the seventh day was of ALL the soldiers." — *Avid. Cass.* 6; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 73.

[9] "At the request of the populace [Marcus Antoninus] ordered, indeed, a lion to be brought into [the arena] which had been taught (?) to eat human beings, but he neither witnessed him, nor emancipated his teacher." — **Dio Cass. 71,** 29; Vol. **4,** p. 438. Yet he censures (*De Rebus,* **10,** 8) not the brutal spectators, but their unphilosophical victims.

[10] "What a soul is that, which, when separation from the body becomes necessary, is ready for extinction, or dispersion, or continued existence, a readiness resulting from its own judgment, not from mere obstinacy as [in] the Christians." — **M. Antoninus,** *De Rebus,* **11,** 3.

unchanged, though it had a different antagonist. While pestilence raged, and when a thorough cleansing of the city was, no doubt, desirable, the emperor, by the multitude of his sacrifices,[11] made it a public slaughter-house in a fashion which would have shocked a modern sanitary committee. His extravagance in this direction may have caused an antagonistic extravagance, of physically less injurious kind, among some monotheists.[12]

The priests whom the emperor summoned from different directions were mostly perhaps created for the occasion. Even under Claudius, a century earlier, all knowledge concerning heathen rites had died out.[13] How far these doings originated with the emperor and how far with his advisers may be a question.[14] Christian writ-

[11] The statement in **Smith's** Dictionary, Vol. **1**, p. 440, col. 2, that "victims were offered to the gods with the most unsparing profusion," seems to be implied, rather than asserted, in the life of this emperor by Julius Capitolinus, 13, 21, in *Script. Hist. August.* pp. 48, 54. Compare Appendix, Note J, foot-note 14 near its close.

[12] The **Recognitions of Clement** say, concerning blight, hail, and pestilence: "From the beginning of the world there was nothing of these things, but they originated in the impiety of men [their ἀσέβεια? non-recognition of God], . . . altars kindled to demons have also POLLUTED THE AIR with the impure smoke of sacrifices, and SO AT LENGTH the elements became corrupt." — Book **8**, cc. 48, 51. The Clementine Homilies (**3**, 45) maintain that sacrifices in the Jewish dispensation were not by the command of God.

[13] See extract from Tacitus, *Annals*, **11**, 15, quoted in note 126 on p. 225.

[14] The rule of action adopted by Marc Antonine rendered him the tool of the aristocracy. "He always, before doing anything in war, or in civil matters, consulted men of rank *optimatibus*. Moreover his especial opinion always was, '*It is more equitable that I should follow the counsel of so many and such friends, than that so many and such* [*men*] *should follow my wish* [*that*] *of a single friend.*'" — **Capitolinus**, *M. Antonin.* 22; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 55. This was an easy method of shirking responsibility. The aristocracy, doubtless, knew how to employ him in an apparently commendable manner. According to **Dio Cassius** (**71**, 6), he "OFTEN," in the administration of justice, devoted eleven or twelve days to a case, sitting until night, and instead of enjoining brevity "he habitually commanded abundance of water to be measured out to the pleaders" in the water glasses for the measurement of time.

ings render probable that these proceedings were accompanied by a persecution of Christians. The conservative party, however, did not yet feel their cause so desperate as in the days of Arnobius.[15]

CHAPTER XIII.

HUMAN CULTURE.

§ 1. *Moral, Literary, and Mental.*

A FULL treatise on the above heading would require a volume. The object of the following remarks is simply to point out some relations between these three classes of culture, and to draw a lesson from history as to their value.

Moral culture is a prerequisite to the safe establishment of free institutions,[1] and is necessary even to prevent disintegration of society.[2] To individuals it is a most

---

[15] See Ch. V. note 64.

[1] "The spirit of liberty is not merely, as multitudes imagine, a jealousy of our own particular rights, an unwillingness to be oppressed ourselves, but a respect for the rights of others, and an unwillingness that any man, whether high or low, should be wronged and trampled under foot." — **Channing**, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 341.

[2] "There may be much intellectual culture [compare Seneca, *Epist.* 88, 2, cited on page 49] which will not tend even indirectly to form men to the ready practice of their duties, or to bind them together in mutual sympathy and forbearance, unless it be united with just conceptions of our nature and the objects of action. Let us form in fancy a nation of mathematicians, like La Place or La Lande, ostentatious of their atheism; naturalists as irreligious and impure as Buffon; artists as accomplished as David, the friend of Robespierre; philosophers, like Hobbes and Mandeville, Helvetius and Diderot; men of genius, like Byron, Goethe, and Voltaire; orators as powerful and profligate as Mirabeau; and having placed over them a monarch as able and unprincipled as the second Frederic of Prussia, let us consider what would be the condition of this

important element in the formation of sound judgments.[3] In its absence the mental powers are frequently misdirected and frittered away, or clouded by bad feelings, or wasted in personal disputes,[4] or impeded by self-indulgence, or impaired by physical vices. These truths, though recognized and inculcated by some, have been too little appreciated.

Another fact unnoticed, or too little noticed, is that MORAL PURPOSE IS A DIRECT AND POWERFUL STIMULUS TO MENTAL DEVELOPMENT. If two individuals of equal capacity start in life, one with moral aims earnestly held and the other without them, the former will far more certainly than the latter become intelligent. Moral purpose forces upon us daily questions of right and wrong towards our fellow-men, our family, and ourselves. Attention to these questions creates A HABIT OF OBSERVATION AND RE-

highly intellectual community, and how many generations might pass before it were laid waste by gross sensuality and ferocious passions. So far only as men are impressed with a sense of their relations to each other, to God, and to eternity, are they capable of liberty and the blessings of social order."—**Norton**, *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 25, 26. "The exaltation of talent, as it is called, above virtue and religion, is the curse of the age. Talent is worshipped; but, if divorced from rectitude, it will prove more of a demon than a god."—**Channing**, *Works*, Vol. **2**, p. 362.

[3] "Whoever desires that his intellect may grow up to soundness, to healthy vigor, must begin with moral discipline. Reading and study are not enough to perfect the power of thought. One thing above all is needful, and that is, the Disinterestedness which is the very soul of virtue. To gain truth, which is the great object of the understanding, I must seek it disinterestedly. Here is the first and grand condition of intellectual progress. . . . Without this fairness of mind, which is only another phrase for disinterested love of truth, great native powers of understanding are perverted and led astray; genius runs wild; 'the light within us becomes darkness.'"—**Channing**, *Works*, Vol. **2**, pp. 360, 361.

[4] Let any one, after reading in Thiebault (*Anecdotes of Frederick the Great*, Vol. **2**, pp. 384–399) the quarrels between Maupertuis and Voltaire, and between the latter and Frederic, ask himself whether it were possible in an atmosphere of contention, befitting grown-up children, that human judgment should not be warped and distorted by malevolent feeling.

FLECTION which does more for mental development than any other one agency. An individual without moral aims may, or may not, derive from his surroundings in life a constant inducement to effort. In most cases he will not, and, even when he does, his judgment is more likely to be warped by feeling or self-interest. These remarks are in a yet greater degree true of two communities. One in which moral aims are prominent will inevitably become intelligent far more rapidly than another which places such aims in the background.

Literary culture, aside from its indirect aid to morality and intelligence by opening stores of human experience, supplies a want which, if unsupplied, would bar moral, as other, progress. It furnishes terms whereby we can express to ourselves and lay up distinctly in memory the result of our observations. As arithmetical calculations would become a mass of confusion if we had but one term or figure for a great variety of numbers, so in morals and in estimating varieties of human character, if things essentially different have, through poverty of language, to be expressed by one term, they become readily confused. Moreover, communication on moral topics with others is, under such circumstances, difficult and imperfect.

Mental culture — the acquisition of knowledge and of the capacity to use it[5] — may be promoted by a variety of outside aids and incitements. It has an inherent worth because of ability which it imparts for increasing our own welfare and that of others. It has also, in civilized society, much bearing on moral culture, not merely of the community, but of individuals. The co-operation of intelligence with individual morality is exerted in a variety

[5] "Intellectual culture consists, not chiefly, as many are apt to think, in accumulating information, though this is important, but in building up a force of thought which may be turned at will on any subjects, on which we are called to pass judgment. This force is manifested in the concentration of the attention, in accurate, penetrating observation, in reducing complex subjects to their elements. . . . To build up that strength of mind which apprehends and cleaves to great universal truths, is the highest intellectual self-culture." — **Channing**, *Works*, Vol. **2**, pp. 362, 363.

of ways, direct and indirect. It brings us in contact with a wider public opinion, thus aiding emancipation from local errors in morality. It enables us to study more discriminatingly the actions and characters of our neighbors, as also the influences to which they are subjected, and thus not only obviates causeless dissensions and jealousies, but unveils opportunities of kindness. It facilitates scrutiny into the experience whether of ourselves or of others, thus guarding us against missteps, innocent in themselves, which would render subsequent adherence to morality more difficult. It prevents our being misled by skilful misrepresentation of wrong as if it were right. It prepares us against moral emergencies by suggesting questions and aiding reflection, thus rendering possible WELL-MATURED OPINIONS OF THE COURSE TO BE PURSUED IN MANY CONTINGENCIES OF LIFE. It opens facilities for intercourse with the morally judicious and wise. It strengthens our capacity for physical and moral self-discipline.

The foregoing assumes that conscience merely enjoins doing right and avoiding wrong. In some cases right and wrong are obvious. But in the vast majority of questions which civilization and culture bring with them, our conscience by commanding us to do right imposes an obligation of first ascertaining it.[6]

Aside from the moralities of private life there exists under free governments a class of duties unrecognized by absolute monarchies,[7] those, namely, which pertain to

---

[6] Conscience may require a mechanic to do his work well, but cannot by intuition decide for him the requisite strength of a bridge, a boiler, or an axle; nor for a conscientious legislator the relative effect of different proposed laws; nor for a professional man the exact proportion of time due to his family and to his patients, or clients, who need and depend on his aid for their lives, or means of living. A business man in pecuniary embarrassment cannot, in most cases, tell by intuition whether an extra loan will extricate him and permit justice to all his creditors, or whether it will but increase their number. The conscientiously benevolent may need debate as to whether they should give or withhold. If multitudinous questions of right and wrong could be determined without thought, conscience would cease to develop the mental powers.

[7] In the winter of 1840–41, while conversing one evening at Berlin, I

improvement or development of the community and to amendment of its organization or legislation. Nothing is plainer than that, in the absence of intelligent morality, these will be badly performed, or will remain undone.

If we now turn to Greek and Roman history, we are taught the value of moral aims. Where monotheism had spread these aims, namely, in Asia Minor, Syria, and Northern Egypt, we find most peace, industry, intelligence, and general culture.[8] The coincidence between the rise of this, so called, GREEK CULTURE and the advent of monotheistic influence favors the supposition that it was chiefly due to moral aims which that influence diffused. In the fourth century before the Christian era we find the Jews already prominent in two of these countries, whilst the indirect evidence of their subsequent numbers assures us that the same had taken place in the remaining one.

---

needed the German expression for *public spirit* and asked it from an old gentleman who considered it for a time, then debated it with others, and finally told me, "There is no corresponding term in German, and the reason for it is, we do not have the thing. The police takes care of everything here." The term "Gemeinnützigkeitsgeist" might, under free institutions, readily acquire the sense of *public spirit*. At present, however, it scarcely means more than public benevolence. In the year 1840, while the author was in Germany, a carefully written article in a leading newspaper of Berlin, after mentioning that a visitation of prisons, proposed by Elizabeth Fry, had been declined, added the following: "This decision cannot but be approved even by one of those who think us enlightened enough now and then to take care of matters of common interest without always waiting for the commencement to be made by the government." An old man, in one of the more liberal countries of continental Europe, wrote me in the same year: "Until we obtain truly republican institutions we shall always find, that whatever we may undertake for the benefit of society at large will be opposed by the people in authority, unless we obtain their protection and patronage previously to giving any publicity to our proceedings." Cp. pp. 95, n. 65 and 577, n. 59.

[8] Compare in notes 23, 24, of Ch. II. the remarks of Cicero concerning Asia Minor, and of Tacitus concerning Syria. The latter country is designated (Tacitus, *Hist.* **2**, 80) as "peaceful and wealthy." The prosperity of Asia Minor (see p. 197) made consular patricians quarrel for its possession as for a prize. Alexandrine culture is well known.

During and after this century we find medicine and astronomy assuming position as sciences[9] in these partly monotheized lands and a body of intelligent moralists, the Stoics, coming into existence. In Greece proper this culture did not exist.[10] In Judæa, where a blending of political and religious authority had substituted ritual ob-

---

[9] Hippocrates, who is said (Smith, *Dict. of Biog.* Vol. **2**, p. 483, col. 1) to have died B. C. 357, was the earliest physician who could be called scientific. At a later date schools of note grew up.

[10] Not one among the prominent physicians or astronomers of antiquity originated from Greece. Not a man of science belonged to her. The temples of Athens evinced professional skill and taste in their architects; but when we learn, that at the date of their erection, "the meanness of the private houses formed a striking contrast to the magnificence of the public buildings" (**Smith**, *Dict. of Geog.* Vol. **1**, p. 264, col. 1; art. *Athenæ*, § VII.), the inference seems unavoidable, that, for the erection of these latter, skilled labor and superintendence were imported. When Cicero studied at Athens, two, at least, of his three instructors, Antiochus and Demetrius, were from Syria, and he went subsequently to Asia Minor to perfect himself. The Stoic teachers at Athens were all immigrants.

Aristotle might seem an exception to the remark that no man of science belonged to Greece. He was, however, not born in Greece, but in Macedonia. His guardian, Proxenus, was a resident of Atarneus, a town of Mysia in Asia Minor, where the city ruler Hermias (Diog. Laërt. *Aristot.* 5) allowed Aristotle great privileges. His father's friendship with Proxenus, and his profession, that of physician, render it probable that he also (see Note M) came from Asia Minor. Aristotle was driven from Athens (Origen, *Adv. Cels.* **1**, 65; Diog. Laërt. *Aristot.* 7) on a charge of ἀσέβεια, unbelief, and had to leave the city secretly. He shows acquaintance with monotheism, his opinion of God being analogous to the Stoic one. His argument for the divine existence is based on the capacity of self-motion. (Compare Appendix, Note K, foot-note 37.) "The boundary of the whole heaven, that which encloses all time and infinity, is the immortal and divine αἰών [ἀεὶ ὤν], *Æon*, named from his ever existing." — **Aristotle**, *De Cœlo*, **1**, 9; *Opp.* **2**, p. 382, lines 50–53. To this Being he, in the next line, as I understand him, attributes the existence and life of everything else. Compare views of his disciples in Origen, *Adv. Cels.* **2**, 13. See Appendix, Note K, for monotheistic views in his predecessors, Xenophon, Plato, and Heraclitus. His thoughts of his father Nicomachus must have been blended with moral teaching, for he termed his work on Ethics "Nicomachean."

servances for moral aims, this culture was also unknown. In Italy monotheism — though some of its literature had been proscribed and destroyed in B. C. 13 or 12 — encountered its most direct and *violent* persecution after the death of Augustus. Whether the better features of the Augustan age were not due to its influence is a fair question. From that time forward the aristocracy strove with varying success to expel, or suppress, to annoy, or hold it in check at Rome. A consequence of this was, that the attractions of the capital and the world's wealth which had been brought thither could not make Greek culture indigenous;[11] nor even lure it to any great extent from the provincial towns which enjoyed medical and astronomical skill unknown at Rome. Three centuries after the Christian era these provinces, in spite of Roman misgovernment and exaction, had so outstripped the rest of the empire, that Constantine, from motives of self-interest, professed their faith and built a new capital adjacent to the strongest of them.

When political control was placed, by the triumph of Christianity, in professedly Christian hands, the mistake was made of supposing that Christian authorities ought to care for and superintend Christian faith and observances.[12] A result of this was, that human dogmas and

[11] "Very few *paucissimi* of the Romans have touched it [the medical art], and they immediately became renegades into [the ranks of] the Greeks." — **Pliny**, *Nat. Hist.* **29**, 8, 2. Compare on p. 12 note 27.

[12] The mistake that Christian authorities ought to take interest in, and supervise Christian teaching and institutions was to some extent honest, though in larger measure due to the love of control. So far as honest it resulted from the inability of human beings to divest themselves of the belief, that a Christian government should do as much for Christianity as they had been accustomed to see the heathen government doing for heathenism. Early education is often hard to unlearn. A lady in republican Geneva — herself connected with the liberal wing of the state church — was horrified at learning from me, that the United States government made no provision to teach children the Christian religion. De Wette, a scholar, exiled for real or supposed sympathy with the anti-monarchical party and counted usually among liberalist theologians, must, as his words imply, have been equally shocked at the thought of

follies soon occupied more prominence than practical monotheism. The sense of individual responsibility to God was weakened or displaced by the degree in which men's opinions and actions were subordinated to ecclesiastical authority backed by civil power. Moral aims became less conspicuous and human culture stood still or receded. Centuries were, however, needed to undo what centuries had built up. When the Arabs overran these early monotheized provinces they found there, and brought with them into Spain, a knowledge of medicine and astronomy, which made their universities the resort of Europe,[13] and, in the days of the Crusades, consid-

---

separating Church and State. "What," he says, "is a physical persecution of Christian belief with fire and sword compared . . . to the flattery and imposition of the so-called love for freedom. . . . According to the counsel of those who assume, and are, therefore, supposed, to stand on the summit of present culture, the state should renounce Christian principle and place itself on the ground of indifference, if not of atheism." — **De Wette**, *Erklaerung der Offenbarung*, p. vi. De Wette may have confronted irreligion, but the non-intervention by government in religious matters, so well established and cherished in our own country, would to him have seemed "indifferentism."

[13] "The literary institutions of the Spanish Mohammedans were so celebrated that they were frequented by Christian students from all countries of Europe." — **New Am. Cyclopædia**, Vol. **14**, p. 809, art. *Spain*. "Under the Christian emperors every town of a certain size had its archiaters (chief physicians), and no one could practise medicine without having undergone an examination by them. They were paid by the state, and in return were bound to attend the poor gratuitously . . . Hospitals and dispensaries owe their origin to Christianity; the pagans appear to have had no analogous institutions. . . . While the western empire had sunk into barbarism, and the eastern, sadly limited, was struggling for existence, medical science found refuge for a time among the Arabians. . . . Their writings consist mainly of compilations from the Greek authors, . . . and all the knowledge Europe had of the Greek authors was derived from the translations of the Arabs. . . . As order again began to emerge from the chaos of barbarism which succeeded the fall of the western Roman empire, MONKS AND PRIESTS BECAME THE PRINCIPAL PHYSICIANS, and a little medicine was taught in some of the monasteries; for a long time the Benedictine monks of Monte Cassino

erable remnants of this culture are said to have existed.[14]

§ II. *Æsthetic Culture, or Refinement.*

Æsthetic culture, or delicacy of perception, expresses the finer culture of various faculties, so that no little discrimination becomes requisite in its use.

Sometimes it expresses a culture of, or chiefly depending upon, physical organs. Thus the appreciation of painting and music must depend largely on qualities — natural or acquired — of the eye and ear, and may coexist with defective mental or moral development.

Sometimes it denotes mental refinement. To this belongs the ready discernment, or appreciation, of beautiful ideas, language, or mental traits; sensitiveness to any uncouth or coarse word or act; a capacity also for so using language, that with, or even without, definite meaning, it shall produce a grateful impression, either by its

---

enjoyed in this respect an extended reputation. From the ninth to the thirteenth century THE JEWS, acquiring in their commerce with the Saracens [?] such knowledge as was possessed by the latter, BECAME CELEBRATED AS PHYSICIANS; and as such, despite the laws which forbade them to administer remedies to Christians, obtained access to courts and even to the palace of the Roman pontiffs." — **New Am. Cyclopædia,** Vol. **11**, p. 346, art. *Medicine.* It would seem more likely, that the Jews derived their medical knowledge from their own brethren at the East, where such knowledge was common. They and the Saracens probably obtained their knowledge in the same locality.

[14] "If we compare, at the era of the Crusades, the Latins of Europe with the Greeks and Arabians, their respective degrees of knowledge, industry, and art, our rude ancestors must be content with the third rank in the scale of nations." — **Gibbon,** ch. 61; Vol. **7**, p. 379, Philada. edit. 1816. "After the fall of Constantinople, learned Greeks escaping from the captured city carried a knowledge of their language and literature to the Western world. Previous to this date the Greek medical writers had been read only through the medium of faulty Arabic translations; but medical men now availed themselves of this new source of information, and translations of Galen, Hippocrates, Dioscorides, etc., were made directly from the Greek." — **New Am. Cyclopædia,** Vol. **11**, p. 347, art. *Medicine.*

musical flow, its cadence, or its rhythm, or by the word-pictures which it presents, or the associations which it recalls.[15]

Sometimes it indicates culture of moral faculties; delicate cognizance of, and adaptation to, another's state of mind or feeling; habitual readiness to perceive, conjoined with care and tact to avoid, what may irritate or wound, what may arouse prejudice, quicken wrong desire, discourage right effort, or awaken painful recollections. It includes appreciation of correct feeling, and skill to elicit or commune with it; reverent appreciation of sorrows or of affections which an obtuse nature might ridicule, and wherewith a morally undeveloped one might trifle.

Sometimes two, or all three kinds of culture may be manifested in action or conversation, and may conjointly be intended by the term "æsthetic." Refined manners are generally the result of both mental and moral culture. Again, the skill wherewith a woman selects and arranges the furniture and adornments of her house may imply a perceptive eye, mental refinement, and, in more ways than one, moral culture. If undue expense be avoided, if the pictures on the walls appeal to kindly and generous emotions, they may indicate a cultivated heart, or a developed moral sense. Clearness requires that different senses of the term "æsthetic" should not be confounded.

In heathen Greece and Rome æstheticism concerned itself chiefly with what was physical. The remains of heathen sculpture evince that the artist strove to portray physical grace and beauty, or muscular development and struggle, rather than mental emotion or moral traits. Even for this the skill seems to have been imported from lands which had been cultivated by monotheistic influ-

[15] In every refined community taste in some individuals has been developed at the expense of judgment. A well-delivered discourse, destitute of anything save beauty of language, illustration, and sentiment, or a book written in the same vein, produces on them an effect similar to what they would experience at the sight of a beautiful landscape, or in listening to favorite music. Others again, while requiring sense, need grace of diction to a degree that detracts from earnestness.

ence.[16] Portrait-painting must have been cultivated by monotheists, for Sirach states (**38**, 27) that the artist shall by sleepless attention render his work perfect. In the field of sculpture they, during the age of heathen supremacy, must have labored only to a limited extent. They would have found little sale for works, save of a class which they did not care to execute, — works connected with idolatry or heathen customs. The beauties of nature found recognition almost exclusively among monotheists.[17]

---

[16] The defect of heathen art can be illustrated by comparing it with some modern productions. In a work by Rogers called "Mail Day," a common soldier perplexes his brain as to what he shall write home. Grace and beauty are subordinated to the expression of a mental state. The piece appeals to cultivated feeling.

Heathen efforts must have been rude before monotheistic influence. Pliny states (Nat. Hist. **34**, 16, 2) that even in Etruria, more skilful than Rome, images were of wood until after the conquest of Asia. Had high skill been indigenous at Athens, there is no reason why bronze and marble statuary in Italy should have awaited the conquest of Asia. If, on the contrary, the skill in Greece were imported, we can comprehend the statement in an article on Phidias (**Smith**, *Dict. of Biog.* **3**, p. 243): "A contrast exists [as regards ancient artists] between what we know of their fame and . . . works, and what we can learn respecting . . . their lives." Their early lives were unknown to the people among whom they labored. Compare a quotation from Smith in note 10. The Jupiter of Phidias was a patchwork concern of wood or stone plastered with ivory and gold. Even as regards sculpture and painting their condition among modern Asiatics fairly suggests that moral culture, if not a prerequisite in the artist, must exist in the community by whose influence he is formed.

[17] "When I consider thy heavens . . . the moon and stars which thou hast ordained, what is man that thou art mindful of him." — **Ps. 8**, 3, 4. "O Lord . . . who stretchest out the heavens as a curtain, . . . the earth is full of thy riches." — **Ps. 104**, 1, 2, 24. "He . . . that stretcheth out the heavens as a canopy and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." — **Is. 40**, 22. "There is one glory of the sun and another of the moon and another of the stars." — **1 Cor. 15**, 41. "I will be as the dew to Israel, he shall bloom as the lily. . . . His beauty shall be as the olive-tree. . . . They that dwell under his shadow . . . shall revive as the corn and grow as the vine." — **Hosea 14**, 5–7. "Consider the lilies of the field. . . . I say unto you that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." — **Matt. 6**, 28, 29. "The heavens de-

The species of æsthetic culture which consisted in word-pictures, in a dexterous use of beautiful language, of pleasing illustration, or of attractive allegory, had its seat at Alexandria. Its remains favor the supposition that it dwelt mainly among Jews and monotheists. Disciples of this school, rather than of heathenism, attained chief skill in its use, and have left the most finished specimens of the high perfection to which they carried it. Clement and Origen, in the latter part of the second and first half of the third century, Valentinus and his followers, at and before the middle of the second, have no compeers in this direction among heathens. Philo, still earlier, shows the same tendency with less skill. The Epistle to the Hebrews has not a little of this Alexandrine trait.

Moral æstheticism and its results are of course to be found chiefly in communities which give prominence to moral culture. Refinement of feeling, respect for the affections, and quickness of sympathy are seldom matters of historical record. What we find concerning them, or implying them, must be sought principally in the writings of monotheists, or of those who have been influenced by monotheism. In such writings we find a prominence given to home relations, and a delicacy of feeling inculcated [18] which is absent, or nearly so, from heathen records.

---

clare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. . . . The sun . . . which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race." — **Ps. 19**, 1, 4, 5. "The pure firmament, the appearance of heaven, a magnificent spectacle, . . . the glory of the stars, a light-giving ornamentation. . . . See the rainbow, intensely beautiful in its splendor, and bless him who made it. . . . It bands the heaven with a glorious encirclement, and the hands of the Most High have stretched it." — **Sirach, 43**, 1, 9, 11, 12.

The people to whom such language was addressed must have been thought competent to appreciate it. Heathen poets call no one's attention to the beauties of nature.

[18] "The Lord has elevated the father above his children and established the mother's authority over her sons. . . . He that is obedient unto the Lord will be a comfort to his mother. . . . Honor thy father and mother, both in word and deed. . . . My son, help thy father in his age, and grieve him not as long as he liveth. And if his understanding fail, have

The superior reverence for woman and for maternal influence [19] which prevailed among monotheists, as compared

---

patience with him, and despise him not when thou art in thy full strength. For the relieving of thy father shall not be forgotten. . . . He that forsaketh his father, equals a blasphemer ; and he that angereth his mother, is cursed of God." — **Sirach, 3,** 2 - 16.

"Hear, O my son! the instruction of thy father,
And neglect not THE TEACHING OF THY MOTHER." — **Prov. 1,** 8, Noyes's tr.
Compare Prov. **6,** 20 ; **13,** 1 ; **15,** 20 ; **23,** 22, 25.

"Better is a dinner of herbs, where there is love,
Than a fatted ox and hatred therewith." — **Prov. 15,** 17, Noyes's tr.

"Anxiety in the heart of a man boweth it down;
But a kind word maketh it glad." — **Prov. 12,** 25, Noyes's tr.

"The charm of a man is his kindness." — **Prov. 19,** 22, Noyes's tr.

"A soft answer turneth away wrath." — **Prov. 15,** 1.

The meaning of the following can be best conveyed by paraphrasing it : —

"A rightly worded answer
Equals an affectionate kiss." — **Prov. 24,** 26.

"Do not accompany your kind offices with censure, . . . a word is [sometimes] better than a gift, . . . both will be found in a kindly disposed man." — **Sirach, 18,** 15 - 17.

[19] "Houses and riches are an inheritance from fathers;
But a prudent wife is from the Lord." — **Prov. 19,** 14, Noyes's tr.

"He that findeth a wife findeth a blessing,
And obtaineth [a] favor from the Lord." — **Prov. 18,** 22, Noyes, tr.

"Her children rise up and extol her;
Her husband, and praiseth her." — **Prov. 31,** 28, Noyes's tr.

"Do not [through indifference] miss a wise and good wife, for she is a boon beyond gold." — **Sirach, 7,** 19. Compare the utterance of Valentinus (Ch. XI. note 9) that a man is degenerate who has passed through life without loving a woman.

"Blessed is the husband of a good wife. . . . As the rising sun in the heavens, so is the beauty of a good wife in the world of her household. . . . As a light in a consecrated candlestick, so is the beauty of her face in ripe age." — **Sirach, 26,** 1, 16, 17.

"Ye husbands, dwell with . . . giving honor to your wives, as coheirs to the favor of [a future] life." — **1 Pet. 3,** 7. "Exhort . . . the elder women as mothers, the younger as sisters." — **1 Tim. 5,** 1, 2. Compare the preceding note.

with heathens, is sure evidence, that in its company existed a higher refinement than elsewhere of the feelings and affections. Dio Chrysostom, though nominally a heathen, grew up surrounded by monotheism. Its refining influence is manifest in his writings.

§ III. *Industrial Culture.*

The prosperity of any community and the welfare of its individual members depend largely on habits of industry. Where these are wanting, vice and discontent are sure to enter. An unoccupied mind craves excitement, and can only be satiated by injury, or ruin, to itself.

The Indians of America illustrate this. In those sections of the continent where men were accustomed to labor, namely, in South America, Central America, Mexico, and to a slighter degree in the southern half of the United States, large bodies of the aborigines exist. In the northern portion of the United States, where labor disgraced a man,[20] their race has almost passed away. They acquired

---

[20] "The life of an Indian when at home in his village is a life of indolence and amusement. To the woman is consigned the labors of the household and the field; she arranges the lodge; brings wood for the fire; cooks; jerks venison and buffalo meat; dresses the skins of the animals killed in the chase; cultivates the little patch of maize, pumpkins, and pulse which furnishes a great part of their provisions. . . . As to the Indian women, . . . they would despise their husbands could they stoop to any menial office, and would think it conveyed an imputation upon their own conduct. It is the worst insult one virago can cast upon another in a moment of altercation. 'Infamous woman! . . . I have seen your husband carrying wood into his lodge to make the fire. Where was his squaw that he should be obliged to make a woman of himself?'" — **W. Irving,** *Astoria* (Works, Vol. **8**), pp. 206, 207. "Mr. May made an address to an assembly of Onondaga Indians, including several chiefs. In the plainest terms he told them that, if they expected or desired to prosper, they must overcome their contempt for hard work, and devote themselves to regular and constant industry. As soon as he ended and 'paused for a reply,' an old chief arose, with an expressive grunt of disgust, and stalked off in silent dignity. He was followed by all the other

the vices without the virtues of white men, and, within the lifetime of a man, have nearly perished from the width of a continent.[21]

Again, among their white successors, in the northern, or non-slaveholding portion of the United States, industry has been reputable. In the southern portion slavery, while it existed, cast a stigma on labor. The migrating myriads of Europe have poured in ceaseless streams over the northern section of our country, while only exceptional individuals have sought the south. That a country may prosper, industry must be esteemed.

The bearing of industrious habits upon INDIVIDUAL happiness attracts too little notice. The man or woman whose time is adequately occupied, acquires an efficiency, and, if the occupation be sufficiently diversified, a self-dependence, which idleness cannot give. The mind is protected also against hankering for excitement, physical or social, and is less a prey therefore to folly and vice. In a single respect this latter remark may be illustrated by the condition of modern Jews. Their average morality is not above that of Christians; yet their freedom from physical vices is much greater. A Jewish drunkard or pauper is, in our own country, rarely met; most probably because a Jewish idler is seldom seen, and if common report can be trusted, the houses of shame find few recruits among Jewish women.

Aside, however, from protection against vice, habits of industry serve to develop and strengthen the character, and, if the industry be physical without being excessive,

---

hearers, until the offending speaker was left entirely alone." — **Memoir of S. J. May**, pp. 231, 232.

[21] Eighty years ago there stood at one end of the street on which the author lives a stockade fort enclosing a blockhouse and a private dwelling. In or near it were (August 10, 1794) fifteen white men, some of them with families. They constituted the white population of the county, and were gathered for safety near the fort, because the Indians had sent notice that they intended to clean them out. On that day two boys whose father had just been fired upon were hurried into the fort. They are yet (A. D. 1874) enjoying a vigorous old age, but the Indians, from the Alleghanies to the Pacific, are in this latitude almost extinct.

to give such tone and buoyancy to the human frame that, in the absence, and sometimes even in spite, of constitutional impediment, the spirits become joyous, the sympathies quick, the energies untiring, and the capacity both of enjoyment and usefulness great. Overwork, of course, defeats all this, and creates in some a longing for physical stimulus. Modern occupations, even when physical, tax the mind more than in former times.

The question of industrial education for the young demands attention vastly beyond what it has received. The parent who wilfully, or through indifference, neglects to bring up a child in habits of industry and to familiarize it with waiting on itself and making itself useful, is committing a crime against the child's future welfare. Many difficulties stand at present in the way, some of which require combined effort for their removal,[22] while others merely claim from the parent good sense, fidelity, and an appreciation of the object to be attained.[23] Much could

---

[22] The number of hours and amount of studies in public schools render it a hardship towards most children to superadd home occupations. As a prerequisite to remedying this, school studies, especially for children under twelve years, or thereabouts, should be abbreviated. Habits of personal industry and self-help are seriously important, and should not be unduly sacrificed even to attainments at school.

The absence of many fathers from home during a large part of each day interferes not only with their facilities for teaching industry to their children, but with opportunity for studying their characters, keeping in sympathy with, and rightly directing them. Mitigation for this evil might be devised. Earnest attention should be called to it. While it exists, it devolves an additional duty on the mother.

Improved machinery accomplishes much work formerly intrusted to juvenile hands. Thought and public effort should be devoted to the subject, that this end not in juvenile idleness.

Absence of refinement in the laboring classes, especially in those from Europe, causes aversion to such occupations as might seemingly put us on a par with coarseness. The only remedy is to diffuse refinement among the working classes.

[23] A boy, though exposed by idleness to a greater variety of temptations than his sister, has one great advantage over her. If he marries, he can, as clerk or junior partner, learn some occupation before endeavor-

be effected by a cultivation of refinement in the laboring classes, thus rendering associations with labor more pleasant. In our own country the laboring classes, though misled sometimes by the presentation of folly as wisdom, and of antagonism to employers as independence, are attaining culture. The impediments are in many localities light and diminishing. In continental Europe, however, the impediments are fearful, and among these is the mag-

---

ing to superintend it. The sister, if married, becomes the head of a household, and needs to superintend that of which she is perhaps totally ignorant. Incompetent superintendence makes the duty of domestics more trying, opening a door to friction and discontent. The relation between her and her feminine aids, instead of giving rise to lifelong endearments and interest in each other's welfare, becomes an injury to character, causing or aggravating distaste for home superintendence on the one side, and for domestic service on the other. Familiarity in early life with household duties, under guidance of parents as to the best method of dealing with various dispositions, might have given a different aspect to these relations, and, if general throughout society, might make domestic service attractive to many who now shun it, though suffering for lack of employment.

Europe suffers, though in a modified form, equally with America from this class of difficulties. More than thirty years ago, an old philanthropist in continental Europe asked me to send him as a corrective half a dozen copies of Miss Sedgwick's "Live and Let Live," remarking that half the plagues of life originated in miscomprehension between the lady of the house and her domestics. Comments on the subject at Frankfort, Geneva, and elsewhere, evinced that the evil was widespread.

The charge which a judge was uttering from his judicial bench in England when arrested by death, claims attention over too wide a portion of the earth. "Even to our servants we think perhaps we fulfil our duty when we perform our contract with them, — when we pay them their wages, and treat them with the civility consistent with our habits and feelings, — when we curb our temper and use no violent expressions towards them. But how painful is the thought that there are men and women growing up around us, ministering to our comfort and necessities, continually inmates of our dwellings, with whose affections and nature we are as much unacquainted, as if they were the inhabitants of some other sphere." — **T. N. Talfourd**, quoted in the **Christian Register**, Boston, April 15, 1854.

nitude of standing armies,[24] to the abatement of which philanthropy should devote every energy.[25]

The industry of a country may be aided or impeded by wise or unwise customs or legislation, and by the facility or difficulty of obtaining family homes.[26] The variety of

---

[24] The military establishments of continental Europe absorb young men by hundreds of thousands, thus devolving accumulated labor on the infirm, the old, and the women. Overwork bars self-culture. Exhaustion craves and finds mere animal recreation. Marriage is postponed to military service. Laboring women, without avenue to improved social standing, lack a chief incitement to self-respect. Young men removed from home-influence, and from occupations which might interest them, are aggregated into masses, a more easy prey to vice. In the larger cities the proportion of illegitimate births becomes frightful.

[25] As a step towards the desired end, two or three among even the minor powers in Europe might agree upon adding to their own rules of intercourse, and advocating for insertion into the laws of nations some such clause as the following: —

No nation unattacked has a right to make war, nor any community to subvert its own government *by violence*, without publishing a distinct statement of not merely good, but sufficient reasons for its action.

Such a clause would not at first prevent, but merely impede, wars, and diminish their frequency. Each additional nation which subscribed the code, each step forward by public opinion, would place bellicose governments more at disadvantage. The only effectual remedy, however, must be a capacity for self-government in the people, and a control by them — the chief sufferers in war — over international disputes.

[26] A mechanic, or laboring man, owner of a home, has a strong motive for earning and saving, that he may add to its comfort or beauty. A friend of the author was told by prominent factory-owners in England, that four days weekly was about as much as they could get out of their operatives. If so, inability of the working classes to acquire homes is probably a silent discouragement to effort, and therewith, to self-respect. The real estate of England is in few hands. Dismemberment, for sale, of beautiful patrimonies, interwoven with cherished family associations, might be a severe sacrifice on the part of her landholders. But if interest in the culture and elevation of their fellow-men should prompt them to it, a nobler example could hardly be given of Christian thoughtfulness for human welfare. To their children and descendants the companionship of cultured fellow-citizens would be a richer heritage than undiminished acres.

influences which affect it should cause caution in determining the respective weight of each. Yet there can be little doubt that industry was held in more respect by monotheism, and therefore by the communities which it influenced, than by heathenism.[26a] The countries where monotheism had spread were the workshops of the Roman empire. In monotheistic writings a man's occupation is often appended to his name.[27] Paul, a scholar, worked at tent-making.[27a] Josephus appeals to heathen cognizance of the fact, that mechanical occupations were largely in Jewish hands.[28] Philo mentions their workshops at Alexandria.[29] The industrial prosperity of the countries where they settled is attested by patrician desire of obtaining office there.[30] **Cicero,** as already quoted on p. 30, testifies that Asia Minor was the portion of the republic where "reason and diligence effect most." Tacitus bears witness to the peacefulness and wealth of Syria.[31] The Jews are mentioned by Dio Cassius as fabricators of arms for the Romans.[32] Centuries after the Christian era we find adopted in Europe an industrial agency invented in Asia Minor, namely, windmills.[33]

[26a] See in Ch. VIII. at close of note 127, Patrician contempt for workmen.

[27] Mention is made of Joseph "the carpenter" (**Matt. 13,** 55); "Simon the tanner" (**Acts 9,** 43; **10,** 6, 32); "Alexander the coppersmith" (**2 Tim. 4,** 14); "Aquila and Priscilla, tent-makers" (**Acts 18,** 2, 3).

[27a] Acts **18,** 3. "The Talmud makes it the duty of scholars to learn some mechanical art." **New Am. Cyclopæd. 14,** p. 847, col. 1, *art.* Spinoza.

[28] See in Ch. IV. note 6, Josephus, *Against Apion,* **2,** 39 (*al.* 40).

[29] Heathens "broke open even the workshops of the Jews."— **Philo,** *Against Flaccus,* 8, Bohn's trans.

[30] Rulers for Syria and Egypt were appointed, not by the Senate, but by the emperors. The Senate supplied annually a governor to a large division of Asia Minor. The wealth, and therefore the industry, of this province is well attested by the action of the Senate, which long treated it as the prize of consular senators (Tacitus, *An.* **3,** 71), according to the order in which they had been consuls.

[31] See citation and references in note 8.

[32] See in Ch. X. the first paragraph of note 133.

[33] See Gibbon, ch. 61, note 65, Vol. **7,** p. 379, Philada. edit. 1816.

§ IV. *Greek Culture a Result of Monotheism.*

Allusion has already been made, pp. 367–371, to Greek culture as a result of monotheistic influence. A separate section is here devoted to the subject, in hope of thereby attracting to it a more minute scrutiny than the author can give.

The Greek population of Asia Minor, Syria, and North Egypt attained a scientific and practical knowledge combined with general culture unknown among their Gentile cotemporaries. The Romans were dependent on the Greeks even for their cooks.[34] Deferring to a note the evidence that science had not taken root outside of these borders,[35] the question arises as to its cause within them. Commerce was unlikely to do for Asia Minor or Syria more than for Greece. A mere blending of races would not develop intelligence in Asia rather than in Italy. There are but two causes for this culture which seem probable.

Firstly, the Jews outside of Palestine must already, some centuries before the Christian era, have been not only educated,[36] but scientific, for more than one eminent heathen regards them as descendants from, or on a par with, philosophers,[37] and their own writings imply the ex-

---

[34] See close of extract from Lyell in Ch. V. note 52.

[35] See Appendix, Note M.

[36] The **Wisdom of Sirach**, compiled 200 or 300 B. C., contains the business direction (**42, 7**): "Let delivery to, and receipt from, every one be in writing." Writing must then have been common. An earlier writer says: "Of making many books there is no end." — **Ecc. 12,** 12.

[37] "**Clearchus**, who was the scholar of Aristotle, and inferior to no one of the Peripatetics whomsoever, in his first book, *Concerning Sleep*, says, that '**Aristotle**, his master, related what follows of a Jew. . . . This man . . . was by birth a Jew, and came from Cœlesyria; these Jews are derived from the Indian philosophers. Philosophers, it is said, are called by the Indians *Calani*, and by the Syrians *Judæi*, and took their names from the country they inhabit, which is called *Judæa*. . . . Now, this man, when he was hospitably treated by a great many, came down from the upper country to the places near to the sea, and became

istence among them of attention to science.[38] The Jews had spread especially in the above-mentioned countries,

---

a Grecian, not only in his language, but in his soul also; insomuch that when we ourselves happened to be in Asia about the same places whither he came, he conversed with us, and with other philosophical persons, and made a trial of our skill in philosophy; and as he had lived with many learned men he communicated to us more information than he received from us.'" — **Josephus,** *Against Apion,* **1,** 22, Whiston's trans. altered. Perhaps the conclusion should be translated, "he communicated the more readily of what he possessed." The narrative cannot be any fabrication by a Jew, for in that case Jewish learning would not have been attributed to a heathen source. **Clement of Alexandria** (*Strom.* **1,** § 70; Potter, p. 358) quotes **Clearchus** as professing "ACQUAINTANCE WITH [cognizance of?] some Jew who had associated with Aristotle."

Clement also quotes another writer as follows: "**Megasthenes,** the historian [about B. C. 300], . . . writes thus in his third book of *India Affairs:* 'All matters of natural science spoken of among the ancients [of our nation] are also taught by philosophers outside of Greece; namely, among the Hindoos by the Brahmins, and in Syria by those called Jews.'" — *Strom.* **1,** § 72 (Potter, p. 360).

[38] "Honor a physician with the honor due unto him, . . . for the Lord hath created him. For of the Most High cometh healing. . . . The skill of the physician shall lift up his head; and in the sight of great men he shall be in admiration. The Lord hath created medicines out of the earth; and he that is wise will not abhor them. . . . With such doth he heal [men] and taketh away their pains. Of such doth the apothecary make a confection. . . . My son, in thy sickness, . . . give place to the physician, for the Lord hath created him: let him not go from thee, for thou hast need of him. There is a time when in their hands there is good success. For they shall also pray unto the Lord, that he would prosper that which they give." — **Sirach, 38,** 1–14. The perception (implied Gen. **2,** 21) of fewer ribs by one in man than in some domestic animals indicates anatomical observation.

The Wisdom of Solomon is a work of uncertain date, written probably from one to three centuries before the Christian era. Its author, speaking in the name of Solomon, says, God "gave me reliable knowledge concerning the universe, to know the constitution of the world and operation of its elements; the beginning, end, and middle of years; the changes [of the sun's course at each] of the tropics, and the vicissitudes of seasons; the cycles of years and the position of stars; the peculiarities of animals and the [various] dispositions of wild beasts; the violence

and may have imparted more or less scientific knowledge to their Greek fellow-citizens.

Secondly, Jews believed in a Supreme Being who took interest in human morality. Many Greeks accepted the belief.[39] It strengthened conscience and encouraged moral aims, thereby developing observation and reflection. These two qualities became the source of an independent growth.

There is much in modern which may illustrate ancient history. Papal Rome has been as poor an exponent of Christian culture as was Jerusalem of Jewish. China, with no word in its vocabulary for conscience, or moral sense,[40] may throw light on the non-progressive condition of Greece, Rome, and other nations which monotheism had not visited, or from which it was driven out.

---

of winds and the controversies of mortals; the varieties of plants and the [diverse] efficacy of roots." — **Wisdom of Sol. 7**, 17–20.

[39] In a Prologue to the **Wisdom of Sirach**, its translator states as an object of his labor, "to issue the book even to those of the foreign household [that is, to Gentiles] who wish to study and who are already prepared morally, τὰ ἤθη, to live according to the Law," and gives as a motive which had actuated his grandfather, the need "that students should, in their teaching and writing, be useful to THOSE OUTSIDE." Cp. Cc. III., IV., and Note B, footnotes 43, 44. Justin evidently (*Dial.* 80, 122) deemed these converts to Judaism a large class.

[40] A friend, the president of Allegheny College in this place, has, at the author's request, reduced the following statement to writing: "In the year 1850 I visited the city of Shanghai, China, and had an interview with Rev. W. H. Medhurst, D. D., who told me that he had been studying the Chinese language for thirty years, and had found no word in that language which was a synonyme of our English word 'conscience,' or moral sense." — **Geo. Loomis**. Cp. p. 576, n. 53; see also, on p. 29, the absence from Greek and Latin literature, prior to monotheistic influence, of any term for "conscience." The question would be interesting, whether any heathen language, utterly devoid of monotheistic influence, have such a term. A difficulty confronting inquirers would be uncertainty as to the extent of former monotheistic influence, especially in Asia, and as to the date of any ancient literature. On this latter point an error of centuries, in the commonly affixed dates, would, in the absence or unreliability of chronological data, be possible.

Particular localities may hold forth inducements to lovers of money or pleasure, whereof only the intelligent can avail themselves, and in such localities intelligence and deficiency of moral sense may be common associates; even as ignorance and vice hold almost exclusive sway in others. Seasons of speculation may present temptation only to the intelligent; and among them only will the moral failures occasioned by it be found. Yet, if the author's observation have not deceived him, the average morality of intelligent individuals is decidedly above that of the ignorant. On this point the testimony which he places below[41] has much weight in his own mind. Morality and general intelligence in every nation bear a tolerably fixed ratio to each other. By intelligence must not, however, be understood merely the prevalence of *school education*. In Northern Germany, whose school system is reputed inferior to none, intelligence and mental activity are much less common among the masses and

---

[41] My father communicated to me, as the result of his experience, that the *disposition* to dishonesty is most common among the unintelligent, though they set more bunglingly about it.

He had large opportunity of observation, for, as agent and as proprietor, he superintended during half a century (1805 – 1854) landed property in four different counties. There were times of active purchase, when two thousand contracts on file implied an equal number of settlers who had not yet paid for their lands. A visitor from continental Europe said, that in the Land Office he could see more of human nature in one day than in his father's counting-house during a year.

My father's judgment was attested by his reducing disorder to order, and by success in meeting the many difficulties incident to his position. Long-continued indulgence was necessary towards the less fortunate; steady, though gentle, pressure towards the idle, who without it would have failed to acquire homes. Judicious inquiry, patient thought, and discriminating judgment were requisite in distinguishing between the two classes and the modifications of them.

Another quality, important to his work though not to the value of his opinion, was brought to my notice by a white-headed old settler, who, on hearing of his death, called upon me and remarked, that he "never knew any one who had such a knack of encouraging a fellow."

even in the middle classes,[42] than throughout the northern portion of the United States.[43]

A companionship, in most cases, of morality with intelligence implies some relationship between them. On the nature of this relationship the author has already, in the first section of this chapter, given his views. The rise of Greek culture, dating from the advent of monotheism, favors strongly the supposition, that a sense of moral responsibility stimulates intelligence, and that belief in an all-seeing Moral Ruler encourages human efforts. The non-progressive character of China, in spite of its universal school education,[44] corroborates the supposition. So do the teachings of modern history, as recalled by the author. On this point, however, modern history needs a

[42] During a sojourn in Germany more than thirty years ago, the author met five different individuals, of the middle class, who supposed that Americans were all black. The fifth instance occurred at the table of a friend who had discredited his previous experience, ascribing it to lack of discrimination on his part between the uneducated and those from whom knowledge might be expected. The absence of general intelligence is partly, though not wholly, due to impediments (see note 7) which discourage private effort. School education is but an instrument for self-development. If, after receiving it, the hands of a community be so tied as to prevent its use, the instrument becomes of no avail.

[43] The best portions of the United States have in many ways great room for improvement; yet the extent to which they safely dispense with police protection, strikingly illustrates one feature of their moral progress. In A. D. 1865 a million soldiers, trained on the battle-field, were disbanded in the Northern States without police precaution and without causing the slightest apprehension to man, woman, or child.

[44] "In no country of the world is education so general as in China. Though the government fosters only the higher branches by supporting colleges (*hio-kung*) in the large cities and provincial capitals, while the primary schools are sustained only by municipalities or individuals, the knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic is all but universal. Even the lowest peasant or mechanic knows how to keep his account-books. . . . Female education is more limited than that of men, but literary attainments are considered creditable to a woman, and the number of authoresses is by no means small. Printed books are cheaper in China than elsewhere, notwithstanding the clumsiness of the printing apparatus." — **New Amer. Cyclopædia**, Vol. **5**, p. 105, art. *China*.

scrutiny more discriminating, thorough, and dispassionate than any to which it has yet been subjected.

Mankind find themselves on a comparative sandspeck floating amidst what seems a limitless universe. Their study of physical law extends to distances which baffle comprehension. Their study of moral law has hitherto been confined to the little globe which they inhabit, and even ITS lessons have been very imperfectly learned. Yet most minds would be aided far more by a perception of moral purpose than of physical law, in believing that a Moral Ruler sways the universe. The amount of hope, happiness, and improvement dependent on such belief is a good reason for patient investigation of human history.

§ v. *The Dark Ages.*

The dark ages in Europe have been commonly attributed to inroads of the barbarians. This must be incorrect. These inroads date from the fifth century. The last Latin writers of note in Italy[45] were born in the first century, and we find already in the second century unmistakable evidence of that social and political barbarism against which even in the preceding one civilization was ineffectually struggling. This barbarism was due to the political power of the Roman aristocracy and to their depraving use of it. The so-called barbarian leaders were more civilized than their Italian subjects. Under their rule Italy was improved[46] rather than injured. The reason

---

[45] Africa, less influenced by patricianism, produced from A. D. 175 to A. D. 425 with lesser writers, Tertullian, Arnobius, Lactantius, noted for his pure Latinity, and Augustine, — all Christians. Even Gaul's monotheistic section had during this period more writers than Italy.

[46] "Odoacer . . . compelled Augustulus to abdicate. . . . By this act an end was put to the western empire. . . . He ruled the country mildly, enforced the laws, and protected the frontiers." — **New Amer. Cyclopædia, 12,** p. 488.

Theodoric "defeated Odoacer . . . Under his fostering care Italy became prosperous again; agriculture and industry revived; literature and the fine arts flourished; internal improvements went on and new monuments were erected." — **New Amer. Cyclopædia, 15,** p. 422, col. 1. Theodoric in early life had lived amidst Greek culture.

why monotheism failed to improve mankind as formerly was its union with ecclesiastical and political power, so that it was expounded, not by the unambitious and thoughtful, but by the egotistical and selfish who were able to crush out those right-minded views which interfered with their ambition or interest.

CHAPTER XIV.

MONOTHEISM.

§ 1. *Its Origin.*

1. Some monotheistic writers regard belief in a Supreme Being as inherent in mankind, so that only exceptional individuals can divest themselves of it.[1] The history of our race affords no support to this view.

---

[1] The above view — blended by many with an estimate of heathenism more generous than just — has been metrified by **Pope**: —

> "Father of all! in every age,
> In every clime adored,
> By saint, by savage, and by sage,
> Jehovah, Jove, or Lord!"

One of our widely circulated school-books states that: "In all nations and in all ages the untaught mind of man has sought after God, a first great cause. . . . This has given rise to various systems of religion." — **Mitchell**, *New Intermediate Geog.* p. 14, Phil. 1874.

Stoic views, whose origin was unknown, contributed largely no doubt to this error, but its chief source has been a too ready assumption that ideas co-extensive with our personal observation are universal. The same method of inference leads one of Cicero's speakers to treat belief in a plurality of gods and in their human form as universal, and therefore innate. Epicurus "perceived firstly, that gods exist, because Nature herself had impressed an idea of them in the minds of all; . . . a belief in gods is necessary because we have implanted, or rather innate, knowledge of them, . . . and concerning their form we are instructed partly by nature, . . . for we all, of every nation, have by nature no other form for the gods than the human." — **Cicero**, *De Nat. Deor.* **1**, 16–18, *al.* 43–46. Compare Ch. III. note 11.

Various savage tribes — if evidence can be trusted — are destitute of any religion,[2] and a large proportion of man-

[2] "The situation of the missionary among the Bechuanas is peculiar. . . . He seeks in vain to find a temple, an altar, or a single emblem of heathen worship. No fragments remain of former days, as mementoes to the present generation, that their ancestors ever loved, served, or reverenced a being greater than man. . . . Satan . . . has employed his agency, with fatal success, in erasing every vestige of religious impression from the minds of the Bechuanas, Hottentots, and Bushmen. . . . **Dr. Vanderkemp**, in his account of the Kafirs, makes the following remark: 'If by religion we mean reverence for God, or the external action by which that reverence is expressed, I never could perceive that they had any religion, nor any idea of the existence of a God. . . . A decisive proof of the truth of what I here say with respect to the national atheism of the Kafirs is, that they have no word in their language to express the idea of the deity.'

"Among the Bechuana tribes, the name [for God] adopted by the missionaries is *Morimo*. . . . *Morimo* . . . had been represented by rain-makers and sorcerers as a malevolent *selo*, or thing, which the nations in the north described as existing in a hole, and which, like the fairies in the Highlands of Scotland, sometimes came out and inflicted diseases on men and cattle, and even caused death.

"*Morimo* did not then convey to the minds of those who heard it the idea of God. . . . I never once heard that *Morimo* did good, or was capable of doing so. More modern inquiries among the natives might lead to the supposition that he is as powerful to do good as he is to do evil; and that he has as great an inclination for the one as for the other. It will, however, be found that this view of his attributes is the result of twenty-five years' missionary labor; the influences of which in that, as well as in other respects, extend hundreds of miles beyond the immediate sphere of the missionary." — **Moffat**, *Missionary Labors in Southern Africa*, N. Y. pp. 168, 177, 179, 180.

"The aborigines of Australia, **Dr. Lang** states in his work on 'Queensland,' have no idea of a supreme divinity, the creator and governor of the world, the witness of their actions, and their future judge. They have no objects of worship, even of a subordinate or inferior rank. They have no idols, no temples, no sacrifices. In short, they have nothing whatever of the character of religion, or of religious observance, to distinguish them from the beasts that perish." — **Christian Register** (Boston), September 21, 1861.

"So far as my information goes, the religious notions of the Esqui-

kind lack belief in a Creator or Ruler of the universe.[3] Early imbibed opinions have been mistaken for inherent.[4]

2. A different view attributes the origin of monotheism to human observation and reasoning. The universe exhibits evidence of design which it seems impossible to treat as the work of chance, and which cannot be ascribed satisfactorily to any cause save intelligence. The argument from this evidence is powerful,[5] and admits no direct answer, yet human history shows that it can be outweighed, and that it universally has been outweighed in communities destitute of belief in revelation. No community lacking a belief in revelation has ever believed in a Creator and Moral Ruler of the universe.[6] Men must have been unable to credit that such a being, if he existed, would avoid or neglect communication with his earthly children.

3. Yet another view is that monotheism was first

---

maux extend only to the recognition of supernatural agencies, and to certain usages by which they may be conciliated. . . .

". . . The walrus, and perhaps the seal also, is under the protective guardianship of a special representative or prototype, who takes care that he shall have fair play." — **Kane,** *Arctic Explorations,* Vol. **2,** pp. 118, 214; N. Y., 1857.

Compare New Am. Cyclopædia (**11,** p. 148), article *Manitou.*

[3] "There is in Buddhism neither creation nor creator. . . . It [Buddhism] embraces nearly or quite . . . three hundred millions of human beings." — **J. F. Clarke,** *Ten Religions,* pp. 143, 146. Greek and Latin mythologies also ignore any creator. Compare in Ch. I. § II. the absence of any term for a Supreme Being in Chinese.

[4] "All our belief begins with the testimony of others. . . . The man born in China believes in Confucius. . . . Every one born a Turk believes in Mohammed. . . . The vast majority of Trinitarians, Unitarians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Quakers, are so because they were born so. . . . We begin with a traditional belief which we accept without a doubt." — **J. F. Clarke,** *Hour which Cometh,* p. 47. Stationary communities not merely begin with but retain their traditional belief.

[5] See Ch. III. notes 57, 59.

[6] "There are three religions which teach . . . true monotheism. These . . . are Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism." — **J. F. Clarke,** *Ten Religions,* p. 501.

taught by revelation. In favor of this view are the following considerations. The people among whom monotheism originated ascribe it, not to their own wisdom, but to a divine communication. Further, no community devoid of belief in revelation has ever been monotheistic. Further, God, as represented in Jewish teaching, takes an interest in the moral welfare of our race. The immense importance to mankind of acquaintance with such a being justifies the supposition that he would have imparted a knowledge of himself by revelation, whilst the history of men elsewhere renders intensely improbable that any *pretended* revelation, in a previously heathen community, should have been mainly addressed by its author to our moral sense. To a believer in the divine authorization of Jesus there is yet another reason for believing in an earlier revelation to the Jews, namely, that Jesus assumes it to have been made.

The sacerdotal and ceremonial parts of Judaism were probably, as in the case of Christianity, a later addition, of human origin. The Jewish, equally with the Christian revelation, seems to have mainly addressed moral sense and human need of encouragement.[7] That the sacrificial law formed originally no part of it, is strongly attested by extant statements and appeals of religious instructors before the Captivity.[8] Teaching subsequent to the Cap-

---

[7] Compare Ch. II. notes 2, 9 and 10.

[8] Teachings before the Captivity in Babylon.

"I hate, I despise your feasts.

. . . . .

When ye offer me burnt-offerings and flour offerings,
I will not accept them;
And upon the thank-offerings of your fatlings I will not look.

. . . . .

Did ye offer me sacrifices and offerings
In the wilderness, for forty years, O house of Israel?" — **Amos 5, 21-25.**

"For I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them
Concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices,
At the time when I brought them out of the land of Egypt;
But this command gave I to them:

tivity implies that this law had then acquired a more recognized standing.[9]

'Hearken,' said I, 'to my voice,

. . . . . .

And walk ye in all the ways which I command you.' " — **Jeremiah 7, 22, 23.**

" What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith Jehovah;
I am satiated with burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts;
In the blood of bullocks and of lambs and of goats I have no delight."
Isaiah 1, 11.

" For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice,
And the knowledge of God rather than burnt-offerings."— **Hosea 6, 6.**

" I will take no bullock from thy house,
Nor he-goat from thy folds;

. . . . . .

If I were hungry, I would not tell thee." — **Psalm 50, 9, 12.**

" Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah,
And bow myself before the most high God?
Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings,
With calves of a year old?
Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams,
Or with ten thousands of rivers of oil?

. . . . . .

He hath showed thee, O man, what is good;
What doth Jehovah require of thee,
But to do justly, and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly before thy God?" — **Micah 6, 6-8.**

"In sacrifice and oblation thou hast no pleasure;
Mine ears thou hast opened;
Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou requirest not." — **Psalm 40, 6.**

" Look well to thy feet, when thou goest to the house of God, and draw nigh to hear, rather than to offer sacrifice as fools. For they consider not that they do evil." — **Ecclesiastes, 5, 1.**

The above passages are given in the translation of Dr. Noyes.

[9] Teaching after the Captivity.

" For when ye bring the blind for sacrifice,
[Ye say] 'It is not evil.'
And when ye offer the lame and the sick,
[Ye say] 'It is not evil.'

. . . . . .

And ye bring that which is plundered, and lame, and sick,
And present it for an offering;
Shall I accept it at your hand?
Saith Jehovah.

To assume that the ceremonial and sacrificial law had no recognized standing before the Babylonian Captivity, implies that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses. It nowhere professes to have been written by him, and speaks of him always in the third person, a form of self-designation not elsewhere found, I believe, in Hebrew literature. Its commencement is a compilation from two different documents, — or classes of documents, — either of which must have originated later than the belief in monotheism, since that belief is incorporated into them.[10] Its conclusion must have been written long after the time of Moses.[11] To a critic of history the strongest argument against its Mosaic authorship is the moral impossibility, that the anti-ritual writers before the Captivity could have known and ignored or disparaged teachings by Moses which they and their countrymen would have regarded as express injunctions from God. A believer in the divine authorization of Jesus would find it difficult to reconcile his remarks to his disciples with the supposition that he regarded the Deity as having through Moses prohibited certain meats.[12]

Cursed be the deceiver,
Who has in his flock a male,
And yet voweth and sacrificeth to Jehovah that which is marred."
Malachi 1, 8, 13, 14, Noyes's trans.

"Ye have robbed me.
But ye say, 'Wherein have we robbed thee?'
In tithes and offerings.
. . . . .
Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse,
That there be food in my house." — **Malachi 3**, 8 - 10, Noyes's trans.

[10] See Appendix, Note L.

[11] "So Moses . . . died, . . . but no man knoweth of his sepulchre to this day." — **Deut. 34**, 5, 6.

[12] "Are you likewise so devoid of understanding? Do you not comprehend that nothing external can, by entering a man, defile him, because it does not enter his heart?" — **Mark 7**, 18, 19.

Graves, in his "Lectures on the Four last Books of the Pentateuch" (7th edit. London, 1846), has given, on pp. 439 - 452, Le Clerc's citations from the Pentateuch in proof of its post-Mosaic origin.

§ II. *Judaism a Preparation for Christianity.*

The nature and extent of the preparation made for Christianity by Judaism have never been sufficiently stated. Judaism had at the Christian era carried monotheism and morality into a number of lands. The communities which received these two elements of improvement had become noted for intelligence and prosperity.[13] With intelligent morality, however, comes a spirit of scrutiny. Any historical evidence of a revelation made to the Jews was obscured by time and the imperfection of human records. Evidence from the character of Jewish teaching was impaired by the extent to which human error had been blended with the recorded teaching of revelation. At this period — when intelligent beings craved sufficient evidence for the existence of a Divine Parent — a teacher appeared who professed himself authorized by God. If such authorization admit proof, this would seem to have been supplied in the case of Jesus. The evidence was trusted and his teachings found chief acceptance in those countries where monotheism, the result of Jewish teaching, had previously done most for human improvement. In Asia Minor Pliny was astounded at the prevalence of Christianity. Syria and North Egypt were seats of its early strength. The fact that the writings which constitute the New Testament were, with the exception of Matthew, composed in Greek, indicates that the earliest Christian teachers found their disciples among those Gentile populations who were most familiar with Judaism, and whose intelligence best fitted them to scrutinize the claims of Christianity.

[13] See page 367. Strabo (*Geog.* **14**, 4, 13) mentions Tarsus as more scholarly than Athens or Alexandria, and implies perhaps that its citizens when visiting foreign countries were more eagerly retained there than those from other localities.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

SIBYLLINE BOOKS.

§ 1. *Those called Cumæan; a Patrician Forgery. B. C.* 461 – *B. C.* 83.

Nearly fifty years after the expulsion of kings from Rome, a Tribune of the people (B. C. 462) proposed the appointment of commissioners to prepare a code of laws,[1] whereby the consular power should have some other limit than the pleasure of the consuls. The proposition, deferred at that time, was renewed the next year, and was supported by the whole college of Tribunes. Probably the resident foreigners sided with the popular party; for the *Duumviri Sacrorum*, or "Committee of Two on Sacred Things," who belonged to the aristocratic faction, professed to have consulted "Books," according to which, "dangers were predicted from gatherings of foreigners, lest they should make an attack on some of the heights in the city, and thence commit slaughter."[2] The popular party regarded the statement as an imposition, and the Duumviri "were accused by the Tribunes of having gotten the thing up merely to hinder the law."[3]

If books existed which contained any such prediction, they were doubtless a political forgery for the occasion. Perhaps, however, the forgery of what was afterwards called The Books,[4] or, still later perhaps, the Sibylline Books, did not occur until the Duumviri found it necessary to justify their

---

[1] **Livy, 3,** 9.
[2] **Livy, 3,** 10.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] The Latin language has no definite article corresponding to "The," but it is plain that in after times a command by the Senate to examine "Books" meant an examination of "The Books," which were officially guarded.

assertion. These Books, in after times, seem to have been interpolated at the pleasure of the patrician leaders whenever their sanction was wished for brutality which should overawe [5] or mummery which should quiet [6] the common people,

---

[5] During Hannibal's campaigns in Italy strife ran very high between the patricians and the plebeians. After the battle of Cannæ, B. C. 216, "the Duumviri were ordered [by the Senate] to examine [The] Books. . . . According to [the] Fate-telling Books certain extraordinary sacrifices were performed, among which a Gaulish man and woman [his wife ?] and also a Greek man and woman [his wife ?] were lowered alive in the ox-market into a subterranean place, which was closed with a stone." — **Livy, 22,** 57.

This act of outrageous barbarism is also narrated in an extract from Dio Cassius, preserved by Isaac Tzetzis, which speaks of the Romans, under Fabius Maximus Verrucosus, as "burying a Grecian and Gaulish married pair, being frightened [thereto] by an oracle, which said that a Greek and a Gaul would [endeavor to] seize the city." — **Dio Cass.**, ed. Sturz. Vol. **1**, p. 14. Fabius Maximus, named Verrucosus from a wart on his lip, was consul seventeen years before, and also the next year after, the battle of Cannæ, and was Dictator in the year preceding it. Either of these dates would imply a different year from that assigned to the event by Livy; but Fabius, even when not in office, may have controlled senatorial action to such an extent that it should be attributed to him.

[6] In the year B. C. 399, "a rough winter . . . was followed by an unhealthy summer, pestilential to all ANIMALS. As neither a cause nor a termination could be found for this incurable destruction, the Sibylline Books were examined by a senatorial decree. [In accordance with these books] the 'Duumviri for Sacred Things' having FOR THE FIRST TIME made a feast for the gods, *Lectisternium*, in the city of Rome, pacified, during eight days, Apollo, Latona and Diana, Hercules, Mercury, and Neptune, by means of three table-couches provided as bountifully as possible." — **Livy, 5,** 13. The attractiveness of this was increased by the general feasting, in which the people were expected to join. Again, in B. C. 348, a pestilence occasioned an inspection of these books and another feast of the gods. Livy, **7,** 27. And yet again, during a pestilence, "it was found in '[The] Books' that Esculapius [the god of medicine] should be sent for from Epidaurus to Rome." — **Livy, 10,** 47. On another occasion we read, "In Rome and the vicinity many prodigies occurred that winter, or, as is usual when superstitious fears are once awakened, many were reported and incautiously believed. . . . The Duumviri were commanded to examine '[The] Books.' . . . First, a lustration of the city was held, and victims of the more important kind were sacrificed to particular deities. Forty pounds of gold were carried as a gift to the temple of Juno at Lanuvium. The matrons dedicated a brazen standard to Juno on the Aventine mount. A feast for the gods was commanded to be held at Cære, . . . a feast to the goddess of youth at Rome, . . . and Caius Atilius Serranus, the pretor, was ordered to assume vows, [to be performed] if at the end of ten years the Republic remained in the same condition as then. These things performed and vowed in accordance with the Sibylline Books, removed in a great degree

or for political chicanery[7] of whatever kind, if favorable to their own party.

---

the superstitious fears from men's minds." — **Livy, 21,** 62. This was in time of war. Some details of the performance are omitted. Again, in the year B. C. 181, prodigies and a pestilence caused a decree that the Decemvirs should examine "[The] Books." The Decemvirs ordered "supplications for one day at all the shrines *in Rome.*" — **Livy, 40,** 19. Probably the pestilence and the alarm of the people continued, since, "by the direction of the same [Decemvirs] *iisdem auctoribus,* the Senate decreed, and the consuls proclaimed, that supplication and sacrifices should be made for *three* days throughout *all Italy.*" — *Ibid.* As the authority of the Decemvirs rested exclusively on "The Books" which they consulted, their direction fairly implies that in these books, written *professedly* when Rome had no control over Italy, they had found authority for this senatorial decree.

[7] An instance of this occurred, B. C. 205, which needs a word of explanation. The Roman army was rapidly dwindling in front of the Carthaginians from disease, which threatened to exterminate it. (Livy, **29,** 10.) The Senate must have needed the assistance of the whole people in order to prosecute the war, and must have found that burying Gauls and Greeks alive was not the most efficacious method of conciliating those important elements of their population. There existed at this time a large settlement of Gauls in Asia Minor, in what was called *Gallogræcia,* Gaulish Greece, or *Galatia,* Gaulish Asia, a province adjoining on the north side of Phrygia and Cappadocia, and which had once constituted a part of Phrygia. These Gauls were the descendants of a force — the remains of that under Brennus — which had conquered, and settled in, a portion of Phrygia, where their language appears to have been perpetuated with hardly any change until, at least, the fourth century; for Jerome says (Opp. edit. Vallars. Vol. **7,** pp. 429, 430), that it was then the same as that spoken at Treves. In the southwest of Galatia was a city called Pessinus, — subsequently the capital of one half of the province, — and near this city was a large stone, or rock, which had become an object of worship, a remnant doubtless of Druidism, on the part of the Gauls. From them it must have received its name of Agdistis; though it had another name, — "THE IDÆAN MOTHER," — given to it evidently by Greeks, and probably in jest. Perhaps it rested on some hill which they had called Mount Ida. The Roman Senate, having at this juncture ordered an investigation of the Sibylline Books, not, professedly, because of the critical military condition, but because of certain falling stones, did not apparently find anything concerning the stones, but found a statement that, "Whenever a foreign enemy waged war on Italian soil, he could be driven from Italy and conquered, if the Idæan Mother should be brought from Pessinus to Rome." — **Livy, 29,** 10. An embassy was accordingly sent with much pomp to Asia Minor. To guard against wounding the national pride of Greek residents at Rome, it stopped at Delphi, the seat of the renowned Greek oracle. Already before its departure GIFTS had been sent to this oracle, and a response returned that the Romans were about to gain such a victory that they could not carry away the spoils. When the embassy arrived the accommodating oracle assured them that King Attalus would put them in possession of

It was of course necessary to give some account of these Books, and the story of their sale by a woman to a Roman king [8] was perhaps the best which the patricians found them-

---

what they wanted, and that the best Roman citizen must be ready to receive the goddess on her arrival. King Attalus "having received the embassy cordially, took them to Pessinus in Phrygia, and gave them a SACRED STONE which the inhabitants PRONOUNCED TO BE 'the mother of the gods,' and ordered it to be sent to Rome." — **Livy, 29,** 11. The priests of this stone at Rome, as in Asia Minor, either were, or were called, *Galli*, Gauls. It was perhaps anticipated that the Gauls at Rome would take pride in the power attributed to a divinity of their own nation, and would be anxious that her credit should not be impaired by any further defeat to the Romans. The priests, or attendants, of this stone, *Idææ matris famuli*, were the only ones at Rome who (Cicero, *De Legibus*, **2,** 9, 16; al. 22, 40) had the privilege of BEGGING; a tolerably satisfactory evidence that they were not selected from aristocratic circles, and suggesting suspicion that after the stone had answered its political object, the Senate did not care to expend much upon its worship. The temple of the Idæan Mother was not dedicated until thirteen years after she (?) had reached Rome, and then, perhaps, a war with a tribe of Gauls, and an impending war with Antiochus (**Livy, 36,** 36), may have quickened in the Senate a sense of its importance.

The priesthood of this stone seems to have continued at Pessinus; since members of it, some fifteen years later than the above-mentioned embassy, met the Roman army, and prophesied its victory over the then retreating Gauls. (**Livy, 38,** 18.) This and the allusion by **Arnobius** (**5,** 5) to the stone's "UNHEARD OF SIZE" might raise suspicion that the Roman ambassadors had contented themselves with some more portable rock, and had left the original one where it previously stood.

[8] "It is said that under the reign of Tarquin [THE PROUD] another very wonderful piece of good fortune befell the city of the Romans through the benevolence of some god or [good] demon, which, not for a brief period only, but during the city's whole existence, often saved us from great evils. A certain woman, not of his own dominions, came to the king, wishing to sell him NINE books full of Sibylline oracles. As Tarquin declined paying the price asked by her, she went off and burned three, and shortly returned, offering to sell the others for the same price. Being regarded as silly, and laughed at for offering the smaller number at what she could not obtain for the larger, she again went off and burned the half of what remained, and returned, asking the same amount of money for the three. Tarquin, wondering at her resolnteness, sent for his diviners, and narrating the affair, asked what he should do. They, learning through certain signs that a god-given blessing had been rejected, and explaining to him that his not purchasing all the books was a great misfortune, commanded him to pay the woman her price, and to take the oracles which were left. The woman, therefore, giving him the books, and telling him to guard them carefully, DISAPPEARED FROM AMONG MEN." — **Dionys. Halicarnas. 4,** 62. At the close of the narrative, part only of which is here cited, Dionysius says that he is merely quoting from Varro. Whether this remark applies to the foregoing, as well as to the latter part of his narrative, I am uncertain. Lactantius,

selves able to invent. Whether this tale was coeval with the forgery, and whether the woman was originally styled Sibylla, may be doubted. Had the forgers originated a definite account of the books, there would probably have been less discrepance in subsequent narratives. The earliest allusion to Sibylla (for the name originally designated but one person) occurs in the writings of Aristophanes, a comedian, about forty years after the above-mentioned appeal to "Books," and almost a century after expulsion of kings from Rome. Plato some years later also mentions her. She may have been a then existing celebrity, or some tradition of Sibylla, a wise woman, may have existed at Cumæ, which was a commercial metropolis before Rome was more than an unimportant town.[9] The patricians, when pushed to the wall, may have availed themselves of it in accounting for their forgery. No WRITINGS of this lady seem to have been heard of in Italy or elsewhere outside of the Roman archives; and nothing can be more manifest than that those inside were manufactured by senatorial leaders as occasion required.

That the leaders of the popular party should object to the sole custodianship of such books being in the hands of their opponents is natural; and this, perhaps, caused a trifling concession on the part of the latter, namely, that to the Duumviri should be added AS SERVANTS two common people, in whose presence, if at all, the books must be inspected.[10] That this insufficient concession should not quiet the popular leaders, and that they should desire to scrutinize the books, is supposable enough. The effort to ward off such scrutiny may have caused the patricians to invent the story that a former keeper

---

who also professes to copy Varro, says that the books were offered to Tarquinius Priscus.

The elder Pliny, who was later than Varro or Dionysius, says, "All agree (?) that Sibylla brought THREE books to Tarquin the Proud, of which two were burnt by herself, and the third in the age of Sylla, in the conflagration of the Capitol." — **Pliny**, *Nat. Hist.* **13**, 27 (al. 13).

[9] See in the **New American Cyclopædia** the article *Cumæ*. The allusions to Sibylla will be found in Aristophanes, *Eirene* (*Peace*), lines 1096, 1117, and in Plato, Stallbaum's edit. Vol. **8**, p. 392; Bohn's trans. Vol. **4**, p. 406.

[10] Tarquin, selecting two distinguished citizens and joining to them two plebeians AS SERVANTS, intrusted to them the care of the books. "One of these [distinguished citizens] proving in some way unfaithful to his trust, and being informed upon by one of the plebeians, [the king] sewing him into a leather sack, as if he were a parricide, cast him into the sea.

"After the expulsion of the kings, the city taking charge of the oracles

of them had for infidelity to his trust been sewed into a sack and drowned.[11] In the account of him it is noteworthy that his accuser is made to be one of the servant commoners. Regarded from this point of view, the jealous seclusion of the books could not be charged on the PATRICIANS as a mere party procedure. They would say that the effort to punish a violation of this seclusion had come from the party of their opponents, and must be regarded as evincing the common opinion of the time when it occurred.

About the year B. C. 367 (following Smith's chronology) ten men were chosen for the care of these books, one half of whom were plebeians, and not apparently servants. This took place during a prolonged and hard struggle between the two factions,[12] and must have been but a nominal protection to the popular party, since the books were in a building controlled by the Senate. The five plebeians might be present when an examination was made, and might find themselves the unwilling witnesses to some passage which had been previously interpolated. Still later the number was increased to fifteen, a change conjecturally attributed to Sylla. If he were the author of it, we may be sure that as the number could not be equally divided, the patricians would have the advantage. Julius Cæsar added a sixteenth,[13] perhaps to restore equilibrium; but the addition was probably dropped again, for the name Quindecemvirs was the one in subsequent use.

Our materials for Roman history come so exclusively from patrician sources, that we have insufficient means of knowing the views of intelligent plebeians concerning these "Books." On one occasion, what seems to have been a counter-forgery was gotten up, whether as a mere burlesque on

---

appointed as their guardians the most prominent men, who hold this charge during life, being exempt from military service and other civil duties; and they add to them plebeians, without whom it is not lawful to the men to make an inspection of the oracles." — **Dionys. Halicarnas. 4**, 62.

[11] "King Tarquin commanded that Marcus Tullius, the Duumvir, should be sewed in a sack and cast into the sea, because, being bribed, he had given for transcription to Petronius Sabinus 'a book' (or perhaps 'the book') which contained the sacred secrets pertaining to the state; and this kind of punishment was long afterwards adopted by the law against parricides." — **Valerius Maximus, 1**, 1, 13. Compare the first paragraph of an extract from Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the preceding note.

[12] **Livy, 6**, 42.

[13] **Dio Cassius, 42**, 51.

that of the Senate, or for some political object, cannot be certainly determined. It was evidently unfavorable to senatorial prejudices, since the Senate ordered it to be burned. The Tribunes of the People may have thought that they would lose more than they could gain by defending it.[14]

In the year B. C. 83 the Capitol was destroyed by fire, and

[14] The reader by returning to note 6 will find that in B. C. 181 a pestilence was raging, and that the remedy first tried, though professedly from [The] Books, seems to have proved insufficient, and to have been followed by an additional remedy of the same kind taken from the same source. The remedies were open to scientific criticism, and the necessity for a second implied apparently a mistake by these infallible books in dictating the first.

"That same year, on the farm of Lucius Petillius, the scribe, near the Janiculum, in cultivating the earth deeply, two stone chests were found, each almost eight feet long and four broad, the covers being bound with lead. Each chest was inscribed with Latin and Greek letters [according to which] Numa Pompilius, son of Pompo, was buried in the one ; in the other were the books of Numa Pompilius. When the owner, acting by advice of friends, had opened the chests, that which bore the title of the buried king was found empty, without vestige of human body or of anything, time having consumed the whole contents. In the other, two packages, with waxed wrappings, contained seven books each, not only entire, but fresh in appearance. Seven in Latin were concerning Pontifical law. Seven in Greek were concerning Wisdom, such as belonged to that age. Antias Valerius adds that they were Pythagorean, his belief being accommodated to the popular, though probably false opinion, that Numa was an auditor of Pythagoras.

"At first the books were read by the friends who were present at their discovery. Afterwards, when, by the perusal of many, they had become known, Quintus Petillius, the city pretor, a great reader, obtained them from Lucius Petillius. Their intercourse was familiar, because Quintus Petillius when quæstor had appointed him as scribe for the Decuria. Having read the headings of the subjects, and perceived that the most of them were subversive of religion, he said to Lucius Petillius, that he purposed throwing the books into the fire, but that before doing so he would give him an opportunity, if he thought that he could, by law or assistance [of others], reclaim the books, to make the experiment ; and that he might do this without loss of favor [from himself].

"The scribe went to the Tribunes of the People. By them it was referred to the Senate. The pretor pronounced himself ready to make oath that those books ought not to be read and preserved. The Senate decreed 'it should be deemed sufficient that the pretor offered his oath, the books should be burned immediately in the Comitium [place of public assembly]; a price for the books should be paid to their owner, to be determined by Quintus Petillius, the pretor, and the majority of the Popular Tribunes.' The scribe declined this. The books were burned in the Comitium in presence of the people, the fire being kindled by the [official] sacrificers." —**Livy, 40**, 29. According to **Pliny, 13**, 27 (or 13), the name of the scribe was Cneius Terentius. Accounts moreover vary as to the number of the books. Compare Plutarch, *Numa*, 22.

the alleged Cumæan composition perished in the flames. Any extracts from it now extant convey the idea that it was in prose. Subsequent documents called Sibylline were in verse, which may have misled Livy (**29,** 11) into calling an apparently prose extract from it a song. Further, the reader should note concerning this patrician fabrication, that, unlike Jewish ones of subsequent date, it did not concern itself with morality nor with a future existence. Its only allusions are to affairs of this life; and even as regards these it confined itself to the wants of Rome and its vicinity.

§ II. *Verses from Erythræ, B. C.* 76.

The alleged Cumæan composition had before its destruction become an object of reverence to many Romans, both patrician and plebeian. When the Capitol was rebuilt, longings were probably expressed that "The Books" also could be restored. Any such expression of longing would best explain what thereupon occurred.

On the west coast of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Chios, was a city of Ionia called Erythræ, situated on a peninsula. Some Jew at this place, or who operated from this place, fabricated in Homeric verse, and largely at least in Homeric phraseology, a document teaching Jewish views, and containing what professed to be predictions of well-known historical events. The Roman Senate was induced to send three of its members to Asia Minor, in the year B. C. 76, for the purpose of bringing this production, which was carefully laid away in the Capitol.[15] The document professed to have been written by "Sibylla,"[16] meaning, apparently, the alleged authoress

[15] FENESTELLA, a Roman historian who is said to have died A. D. 21, narrates that "on the restitution of the Capitol, C. Curio, the consul, proposed to the Senate that envoys should be sent to ERYTHRÆ, who should bring to Rome the verses of SIBYLLA which diligent search had collected; and accordingly that P. Gabinius, M. Octavius, and C. Valerius were sent, that they might bring to Rome about a thousand verses [that is lines] copied by individuals." —**Fenestella**, quoted in **Lactantius**, *Div. Inst.* **1,** 6. The concluding words of this extract imply, perhaps, that the envoys did not see anything which professed to be original, but merely copies. According to another extract from the same writer, "the Consuls Curio and Octavius took care that these [verses] should be placed in the Capitol, which, under the care of Q. Catulus, had been restored." —**Fenestella**, quoted in **Lactantius**, *De Ira*, 22. Curio and Octavius were consuls B. C. 76, in which year, therefore, this took place. Strabo, *Geog.* p. 567.

[16] I use the Latin term, because I suppose it to have been at this date a proper name, of which either A Sibyl or THE Sibyl would be a mistrans-

of that production which had lately perished. A spurious passage still extant, in the name of Aristotle,[17] may have been forged by the Jew, or by some accomplice, as a means of gaining credence for this assumption. It affirms that SIBYLLA came from Erythræ to Cumæ. If the Sibylline fragment appended below[18] formed any part of the Erythræan document, it must have had the same object. The assumed Sibylla represented herself as the daughter-in-law of Noah, so that the advocates of antiquity could scarcely in this respect have found another to overmatch her claims. This, and her subsequent residence in Italy, implied an unusually long life; an attribute which we find, in more than one writer, connected with the mention of her.[19] Her prediction of Troy's destruction was, among heathens, a better known date than the Noachic deluge. The author of this Erythræan document invented the idea that Æneas, instead of remaining at Troy, — as implied in Homer's Iliad,[20] — had emigrated to Italy,[21] an

---

lation. It became gradually, however, a common name, and, for the sake of convenience, I shall sometimes use the translated terms, which represent its subsequent meaning. These remarks imply that I do not believe in the genuineness of a passage concerning "Sibyls and Bacides" current under the name of Aristotle in the PROBLEMS, sect. 30, quæst. 1.

[17] The forgery reads as follows: "At Cumæ, in Italy, is shown a subterranean cave of response-giving Sibylla, who, they say, remained a virgin during her very long life. She was from Erythræ, but was called by the Italians "Cumæan," and by some Melanchræna." — **Pseudo-Aristotle**, *De mirabilibus Auscultationibus*, quoted by **Opsopœus**, *Orac. Sibyl.* p. 58.

[18] "Since the time when the tower fell and the speech of men
Was divided into many human dialects,
I — having ADDRESSED first the kingdom of Egypt,
Then the Persians, Medes, Ethiopians, and Assyrian Babylon,
Then the great self-conceit of Macedonia — am sent
To the little kingdom of the Italians [now] destitute of an oracle."
Sibyl. Orac. 8, 4-9.

[19] **Virgil** twice calls her the "long-lived priestess." — *Æneid*, **6**, 321, 628. In Plutarch's works the tract on the Pythian Oracle mentions "one thousand years" as the lifetime of Sibylla. Vol. **7**, p. 561, Reiske's edit. Heathen literature did not justify this conception. It must have come from the Jewish verses.

[20] **Smith's** *Dictionary of Biography* says, under the article *Æneas*, concerning Homer's narrative: "Far from alluding to Æneas having emigrated after the capture of Troy, and having founded a new kingdom in a foreign land, the poet distinctly intimates that he conceives Æneas and his descendants as reigning at Troy after the extinction of the house of Priam." The migration of Æneas to Italy, which will be found hereafter under Part D, originated doubtless with the author of the Erythræan verses.

[21] **Dionysius of Halicarnassus**, writing shortly before the Christian

idea which Virgil made the basis of his Æneid.[21a] Perhaps one object of this invention was that he might represent the alleged founder of the Italian state, Æneas, as a genuine or practical monotheist, a subject to which we will subsequently recur.

Of this "Erythræan Sibyl" considerable portions can be identified among extant Sibylline verses with various degrees of probability or with certainty. Its teachings in some passages seem difficult to reconcile with a deliberate attempt at fraud on the part of its author. Perhaps he was led, or urged, on in this direction further than he at first intended. The Senate, in receiving it, showed a gross lack of critical capacity. An outline of the production may render it easier for the reader to appreciate a discussion of its constituent parts. I shall, therefore, under seven heads, give what I deem an approximate outline of the whole work before discussing it in detail. To facilitate reference I distinguish the parts by letters of the alphabet, and, as an aid to the memory, subjoin to each head the kind of evidence on which rests the argument for its having formed part of the Erythræan lines.

A. An admonition to recognize one God; attested by Christian writers, and corroborated, perhaps, by Virgil. Also, a commendation of the Jews from which Lactantius has quoted.

B. A narrative of the creation and of man's history until Noah's exit from the ark; connected by strong circumstantial evidence with part G.

C. A narrative of man's history after the flood until the rise of idolatry and the beginning of war; attested by one or more Christian writers, with corroborative evidence from Virgil, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and perhaps from Josephus.

D. A series of predictions concerning Jewish and Gentile history from the rise of idolatry and the beginning of war until the establishment of God's kingdom; resting on hea-

---

era, says that "all ROMANS affirm the advent of Æneas and the Trojans into Italy, of which also their doings in their feasts and sacrifices are indications, also the Sibylline books and Pythian oracles, and many other things." — *Antiq.* **1**, 49. From this statement two inferences seem probable; namely, that other nations did not affirm the migration of Æneas to Italy, and that the only WRITTEN evidence known to Dionysius was the Sibylline books, for Pythian oracles could not well be classed under that head.

[21a] On Virgil's use of this document see the two preceding notes and pp. 418, 419; cp. pp. 160, 409, 414, 421, 422, 427, 428, 430, 431, 439.

then and Christian testimony. The predictions are disjointed, and some of the original ones are probably lost or altered.

E. God's kingdom, — an era of peace and happiness; attested by Christian, and strongly corroborated by heathen writers.

F. The judgment. No unquestionable external evidence.

G. Concluding words of Sibylla; — attested by Lactantius, and corroborated, if not directly attested, by Varro.

We will now attend to these portions in detail.

Part A.

This division of the Erythræan Sibyl commenced probably with the first thirty or thirty-nine lines of Book **4**. The Cohortatio ad Græcos quotes seven of these, 24 to 30, as from the Erythræan Sibyl,[22] and this direct testimony of an unknown writer is supported by some, and harmonized with by other considerations which I place in the note.[23] In another

---

[22] The title used by the **Cohortatio** (c. 16) is, "That ancient and exceedingly old Sibyl"; elsewhere (c. 38) it designates her as "That MOST ancient and exceedingly old Sibyl, whose books are preserved in the whole world"; and elsewhere (c. 37), as "That ancient Sibyl" who was said to have "come from Babylon . . . and passing into Campania . . . to have uttered oracles at Cumæ." This language could only be applicable to the supposed Erythræan Sibyl who professed to have come from Babylon, and was believed to have settled at Cumæ, and was moreover the only one whose writings were DISTINCTIVELY known, so that they could be appealed to BY NAME.

[23] If the beginning of Book **4** be Erythræan, it could only have fitted at the commencement of the production. The sole question is whether it be such. The direct testimony of the Cohortatio to a part of it is strengthened by the following facts and considerations. 1. The Cohortatio, in immediate connection with the seven lines mentioned above, cites (c. 16) two other passages as from the same Sibyl (*Fragm.* **1**, 7–9 of the Proem, and Book **3**, 721–723), *both* of which are attested by Lactantius (**1**, 6, and **7**, 19) as Erythræan. 2. The Sibyl in these lines professes an impulse to tell men things PRESENT and future. This agrees with the plan of the Erythræan lines (see Part G), but with nothing else extant in these Oracles. The other extant Jewish or Christian productions, in their treatment of history, never deal with the present. This last remark applies to the connection in Book **4**, in which the thirty lines now stand and to which, therefore, they could not well have originally belonged. The Fourth Book, of which they are now the commencement, contains no history of things coeval with the Sibyl. 3. The Erythræan lines endeavored to imitate Homer's *Iliad*. These thirty lines seem to do the same. They open with a call for attention, of which the first word is that used by Agamemnon in addressing the assembled council of Greeks (*Iliad*, **2**, 56). A slightly different form of the same word is

note I give the reasons for mistrusting lines 31 – 39 as not Erythræan, and for rejecting what follows them.[24]

After the above, either immediately or with other matter intervening, — we know not which, — seem to have come three fragments, preserved by Theophilus. Two of these, numbering thirty-five and forty-nine lines respectively, are attested by other writers,[25] and are now published as a Proem or Introduction to the Sibylline Books, being numbered consecutively by Friedlieb as Fragment **1** and Fragment **2**. The third, consisting of three lines, belongs probably before Fragment **2**.[26]

---

used by Jupiter in addressing the gods (*Iliad*, **8**, 5), by Hector in addressing the assembled Trojans and Greeks (*Iliad*, **3**, 86; **7**, 67), and occurs repeatedly in the *Iliad* (**3**, 97, 304, 456; **7**, 348, 368; **8**, 497; **17**, 220; **19**, 101), as does still another form of the same word (**1**, 37; **5**, 115; **10**, 278; **16**, 514; **23**, 770). Again, a negative followed by an affirmative — NOT, followed by BUT — is a frequent occurrence in the *Iliad* (**1**, 24, 25, 93, 94, 115, 116, 124, 125, 131 – 135, 152 – 158, 163 – 165, and elsewhere), and appears also (lines 4 – 6) in the lines under consideration. Moreover the supposition of an attempt to imitate the Iliad affords the most satisfactory explanation of the word "people" being applied to Gentiles. The Jews habitually limited its use to themselves and applied to the Gentiles the term "nations." 4. Erythræ seems to have been the only place in Asia whence the Senate obtained Sibylline verses (see under "Additional Remarks," in § 5, what is said on the nomenclature of these Oracles), and the first of the lines under consideration is more appropriate to an Asiatic than to any other origin. Jews of Greece or Rome would have been unlikely to mention Asia first in appealing for attention. An African Jew would not have omitted all allusion to Africa.

The following considerations, moreover, harmonize with, if they do not corroborate, the Erythræan origin of what we are examining. 6. The Erythræan was the most elaborate and noted of the Sibylline productions, and the most likely, therefore, to have a well-considered opening. But the lines before us are the only instance of such an opening among pieces now extant.

[24] Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* **7**, 23) quotes lines 40 – 43, 45, 46, of Book **4**, as from A Sibyl, which with him is equivalent to saying that they are not Erythræan. Of the intervening lines, 31 – 34 differ from the general tone of Part A, in being moral rather than theological, and they seem to be connected with lines 35 – 39, which resemble more the utterance of a man irritated by false charges from his neighbors, than the deliberate production of a person writing for the Roman Senate some hundred miles distant.

[25] Lactantius makes seven quotations from the first and four from the second fragment, attributing each citation to the Erythræan Sibyl, and saying, as he quotes lines 5 and 6 of the first fragment, that they are from the beginning of her song. The **Cohortatio ad Græcos**, erroneously attributed to Justin Martyr, also quotes, as we have seen, Fragment **1**, lines 7 – 9, as from "that ancient and exceedingly old Sibyl." Virgil imitates a passage in the second fragment.

[26] The other Sibylline quotations of Theophilus are from the Erythræan

None of these are now extant in Sibylline manuscripts. As some readers may desire to perusc these pieces, I subjoin them in the order above specified : —

" Hearken, People of vainglorious Asia and also of Europe,
To all the verities which I am about to prophesy
With my powerful many-toned voice,
I, an oracle, — not of false Phœbus whom silly men
Call God, and make believe to be a prophet, but —
Of the GREAT GOD, whom human hands have not formed
In likeness of speechless idols, hewn in stone.
For neither is his dwelling a statue seated in a temple,
Dumb and senseless, a grievous shame to mortals,
But a habitation not visible from earth, nor measurable
By mortal eyes, nor formed by mortal hand.
HE (who sees all men at once, but is seen by none,
Whose are the obscure night and sunny day,
The stars and moon and sea teeming with fish,
The land and rivers and voice of ever-flowing fountains,
The life-nourishing creations, showers which bring forth
Farm fruit and trees, and vine and olive),
HE has spurred my inmost mind to tell
Accurately to mortals the present and the future
[*From the first until the eleventh generation.*][27]
For He who brings them to pass, told me all things.
Do you, O People, listen all Sibylla's [words],
Who pours forth with hallowed voice a truthful utterance.
Blessed among men shall they on earth be
Who shall delight in the Great God and offer him thanks
Before eating and drinking ; who shall trust in works of practical monotheism,
Who reject all temples which they see,
And altars, — senseless images of dumb stone, polluted
With soul-containing blood and sacrifices of quadrupeds, —
Who look to the glory of the One God." [28]
. . . . .

---

verses. This and the apparent coherence of these three lines with Fragment **2** have induced me to prefix them thereto. Since doing so, I notice that the same position for them is suggested by Opsopœus on page 4 of his notes to the Oracles and is adopted by Alexandre.

[27] I suspect the line in brackets to be an interpolation of later date than the disturbances in B. C. 18 – 12, under Augustus. See, concerning the Tenth Age, pp. 118, 119.

[28] **Sibyl. Orac. 4**, 1 – 30. For the reader's convenience I append a translation of the already mentioned lines, 31 – 39, that he may exercise his own judgment as to their Erythræan origin. **Clement of Alexandria** quotes lines 33, 34 in his *Pædagogue*, **2**, 99, as he had in a prior work, *Protrept.* 62, quoted lines 27 – 30, that is, without informing us whether they are Erythræan.

> " Neither committing atrocious murder ; nor thievishly
> Getting enormous gain, — both fearful things.

"Mortals, men of flesh, who are as nothing,
Why so prompt at self-exaltation, not looking to the end of life.
Do you not tremble, nor fear God, your Overseer,
The Highest Observer, — Allseeing Witness of all things,
The all-nourishing Creator who has endowed all with his spirit
Which we admire, and made it the guide of mortals?
There is one God, who is Alone, Immense, Unborn,
Ruler of all, Invisible; seeing all things,
But unseen himself by fleshly mortals.
For what flesh can with its eyes see the Immortal God,
The Heavenly and True, who inhabits the skies?
Not even before the beams of the sun
Can human beings stand, of mortal birth,
Men who are but blood[29] and flesh with bones.
Recognize Him, who alone is Guide of the world,
Who alone exists to Eternity and from Eternity,
Self-born, Unborn, ruling all things through Eternity,
Dwelling in all, a means of judgment by the light which he imparts.
You have the reward which your folly deserves,
Since neglecting the true, eternal God,
[*To honor and sacrifice holy hecatombs to him*]
You perform your sacrifices to demons in Hades,[30]
You walk insanely and blindly. Forsaking the path
Straight and easy, you stray in that through thorns
And stakes. Why, mortals, do you wander? Stop, heedless ones,
[*Roaming in darkness and rayless night gloom,*]
And leave the darkness of night. Accept the light.
Who does this is all-wise, and cannot err.
Come, do not forever seek darkness and the Underworld.
See how especially cheering are the beams of the sun.
Place wisdom in your hearts, and know
There is one God, who sends rain, winds, and earthquakes:
Lightnings, famines, plagues, and bitter sorrow;
Snow-storms and hail. Shall I say it in one word?
He guides Heaven and governs earth. He is THE RULER."[31]
. . . . .

Not cherishing base desire for another's partner,
Nor yet unnatural and odious lust,
Whose life — its true recognition of God, its morals —
The rest of mankind, eager for shamelessness,
Will not imitate. But, with mockery and derision,
Babes in understanding will falsely charge on them
Their own atrociously wicked deeds."

[29] Literally, veins.

[30] That is, who are dead and gone long ago.

[31] **Theophilus**, *Ad Autol.* **2**, 36; compare Friedlieb, Fragment **1**, lines 1 – 35. To the above Friedlieb erroneously adds three lines from Lactantius, which that writer attributes to another Sibyl.

"If gods have children and remain immortal,
The gods would become more numerous than men,
Nor would there be room for mortals to stand."[32]
. . . . . (?
"If, however, everything born must also perish,
A husband and wife cannot create a god;
But the sole God is One; the Most High, who made
The Heaven and the sun, the stars and the moon,
The fruitful earth and watery sea-surges,
The lofty mountains and perennial fountain currents.
He renews the unnumbered tribes of the deep.
He nourishes what creeps and moves on earth,
And the various birds of clear or tremulous note,—
Nightingales beating the air with trembling wings.
He placed the wild beasts in the mountain-forests.
To us mortals he subjected domestic animals.
HE made the GOD-BEGOTTEN a leader of all
And subordinated to MAN this incomprehensible variety.
For what mortal can know all these things?
HE only knows, who originally made them,
The imperishable, eternal Creator, dwelling in ether,
Who gives to the good an abundant reward,
And excites for the evil and unjust, anger
And war and pestilence, yea, lamentable sufferings.
Why, causelessly conceited men, do ye deride [Him]?
Shame on you for deifying cats and reptiles.
Has not insanity destroyed thought [when you believe]
That the gods steal frying-pans and carry off earthen vessels?
That, instead of dwelling amidst plenty in the golden heaven,
They care for the moth-eaten, and are frightened by spiders?
Senseless worshippers of snakes, dogs, and cats!
You deify also birds and reptiles,
And sculptured stones and hand-made images,
And stone-heaps by the wayside. These ye deify,
Besides numerous absurdities, unfit to mention.

---

[32] **Theophilus**, *Ad Autol.* **2**, 3. No means remain of determining whether anything is wanting between this and the next quotation. In the latter the reader should compare, with lines 3 - 5 and 7 - 9, the following pantheistic imitation of them by **Virgil**, who represents the spirit of Anchises as thus commencing his explanations to Æneas in presence of Sibylla: —

"To begin then; Heaven and earth and the fields of Water,
The moon's shining orb and the Titan-stars
Are nourished by an internal spirit. A mind, infused
Through the members, moves the mass and mingles with the mighty body.
Thence the race of men and of herds and the life of birds,
And whatever monsters the sea bears under its polished surface."
Æneid, 6, 724 - 729.

A similar passage occurs in the *Georgics*, **4**, 220 - 224.

Yet your gods are the deceivers of ignorant mortals.
A deadly poison flows from their mouth.
He, of whom is life and enduring light,
Who pours out to men joys sweeter than honey,
To Him only shouldst thou bow thy head
And incline thy path amidst his constant worshippers.
Forsaking these you seize the brimful cup
Of condemnation, strong, undiluted, and overpowering,
For your senseless selves; all of you in madness.
You will not sober and return to a right mind,
And know God, the King, the All-seeing One.
Therefore the glowing fire shall be your portion.
You shall burn unceasingly through eternity,
Ashamed of your false and useless idols.
But those who honor the true and eternal God
Shall inherit life. During eternity they dwell
In the fruitful garden of paradise,
Eating delicious bread[33] from the starry heaven."[34]

Lactantius quotes, as Erythræan, two lines from the following commendation of the Jews; an effusion which could only have belonged under Part A or Part D. Its use of the present tense renders it difficult of location under the latter and gives it an apparent coherence with the former, which leads me to place it here.

"There is a city, Chaldæan Ur,
Whence comes the race of most upright men,
Who are ever right-minded and their works good.
They are neither concerned for the sun's course
Nor the moon's, nor for monstrosities on earth,
Nor for satisfaction from Ocean's depths,
Nor for signs of sneezing and the augury from birds;
Nor for soothsaying, nor sorcery, nor incantations;
Nor for deceitful follies of ventriloquists.
They do not, Chaldæan fashion, astrologize,
Nor watch the stars. (For all such things mislead, —
Things daily pursued by senseless men,
Who discipline themselves to nothing useful, —
And are a source of error to weak-minded mortals,
Causing many evils to mankind on earth
By misleading from right ways and just deeds.)
But they are concerned about uprightness and virtue.[35]
Their measures are just both in field and in city.

---

[33] That is, manna.

[34] **Theophilus**, *Ad Autol.* **2**, 36; Friedlieb, Proem. **2**, lines 1 – 49.

[35] Two lines between this and the next are absent from some manuscripts and are here omitted.

They do not steal from each other by night,
Nor drive off herds of oxen and sheep and goats.
Nor does neighbor remove his neighbor's field-marks.
Nor does the wealthy man vex the poor one,
Nor oppress widows, but much rather assists them,
Providing them always with grain, wine, and oil;
Always a blessing to those in want among the people,
He gives back part of his harvest to the needy.
Thus they fulfil the oracles of the Great God, his law in song,[36]
For 'The Heavenly' made the earth common to all."[37]

Part B.

What seems to have been the next portion consists of lines 1 – 290 in Book **1**, containing an account of the creation and of other circumstances until after the flood, taken from the narrative in Genesis.[38] These lines are not quoted by any ancient writers, possibly because their contents were of no use in the controversies of that day; but a sufficiently attested passage of the Erythræan Sibyl near its close implies that a narrative such as this had been given:[39] and in that passage occurs a singular use of the word *νύμφη*, a bride, as designating a daughter-in-law, a meaning which would not be suspected from anything in the passage itself, but which finds its explanation in the present narrative.[40] Further, the state-

[36] I suppose this to be the meaning of *ἔννομον ὕμνον*, an accommodation probably to heathen views, which among the Greeks expected divine communications to be in verse. This line may be interpolated.

[37] **Sibyl. Orac. 3**, 218 – 247.

[38] From these lines, however, should be omitted 193 – 196, and perhaps 184 – 187, as interpolations.

[39] See Book **3**, lines 818 – 828, quoted under Part G.

[40] See the quotation of Book **3**, line 826, contained with other matter in Part G. Without other explanation than is afforded by the connection there, Sibylla would appear as Noah's wife.

In the present fragment, when the time has arrived for Noah to enter the ark, God says to him, —

> "Go in quickly, with thy sons and thy wife
> And the brides."— **1**, 205, 206.

And again, on leaving the Ark: —

> "Noah, as if from a chest,
> Went courageously upon the earth, and his sons with him;
> Also his wife and the brides." — **1**, 275 – 277.

And again, Sibylla says: —

> "O, the great joy
> Which was afterwards my lot, in escaping frightful destruction

ment, in the beginning of these lines, as to what the Sibyl purposed,[41] agrees with the concluding statement in the passage mentioned, as to what she had accomplished.

Part C.

This portion included man's history after the flood until the rise of idolatry and the beginning of war, — two evils, — the end of which (according to Book **3**, line 806, belonging to Part E) will occur in millennial times.

In a methodical production by a Jew we should not expect the "tower of Babel" and the "confusion of tongues" to be omitted. Josephus[42] and Theophilus[43] have each preserved as Sibylline a narrative of these events, and in the Sibylline Books, as published, there are three instances in which a copyist or re-fashioner of the Erythræan document seems to have saved labor by opening with this subject,[44] either with or without an allusion to the preceding flood.

An immediate result of confusion in language was the division of mankind into kingdoms, — three, apparently, since they were ruled by Saturn, Titan, and Japetus.

After much suffering, being buffeted by the waves with my bridegroom,
His brothers, his father and mother, and my fellow-brides." — **1**, 287-290.

The Old Testament mentions no grandchildren of Noah in the ark, which is perhaps the reason why his daughters-in-law are styled "brides." Considering, moreover, the extent to which the Erythræan verses copied **Homer**, it is noteworthy that in the *Iliad*, **3**, 130, Helen is called a "bride."

[41] "Beginning with the first generation of mortal men
I will prophesy all things to the last.
What FORMERLY WAS, WHAT NOW IS, and what hereafter
Will occur to the world because of human irreligion.
First, God commands me to state exactly
How the world came into existence." — **Sibyl. Orac. 1**, 1-6.

Compare **3**, 818-828, alluded to above, and quoted in Part G.

[42] *Antiquities*, **1**, 4, § 3. Josephus seems, if we may judge from his using the term "gods," to have quoted at second-hand through some heathen writer.

[43] *Ad Autolycum*, **2**, 31. Of this citation eight lines agree with an equal number constituting part of a passage in the Sibylline Oracles, **3**, 97-107; and, of the remaining two, one agrees with line 5 of Book **8**, whilst the other would seem not to be extant in all the copies of Theophilus. So at least I understand note *f*, on page 371 of Maran's Justin.

[44] **Sibyl. Orac. 3**, 97-109; **8**, 4, 5; **9**, 6-16.

"Men called them, 'Noblest children of earth
And heaven'; naming them of 'earth and heaven'
Because they were most prominent among mortals.
Into 'thirds' was the earth divided. According to each one's lot,
Each reigned, having his part; nor did they quarrel."[45]

Subsequently a difficulty between Saturn and Titan was, through the interposition of their mother and sisters, adjusted by giving supremacy to Saturn, on conditions which his brother imposed, and which his wife's maternal feelings led her to violate. Thereupon Titan and his sons imprisoned Saturn whose children fought for his release. This was the first human war.[46]

Lactantius testifies that the Erythræan Sibyl contained such an account;[47] and adds, apparently from the same source, that after Saturn's liberation by his son Jupiter, he was prompted by an oracle to plot against his son, who thereupon expelled him. Saturn, after much wandering, pursued by Jupiter's emissaries, settled in Italy.[48] The testimony of Lactantius, if it needs any support, is strengthened by other writers,[49]

---

[45] **Sibyl. Orac. 3,** 111–115. The whole passage is comprised in lines 108–155, of which I suppose 108, 109, to be a later addition. See Ch. VI. note 4.

[46] **Sibyl. Orac. 3,** 116–155.

[47] **Lactantius** quotes from **Ennius,** a heathen writer, an account similar to the above, and comments upon it as follows: "How true this account is, we are taught by the Erythræan Sibyl, who makes nearly the same statement, the differences being few and unimportant." — *Div. Inst.* 1, 14.

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] Athenagoras, in his *Legatio,* 30 (pp. 307, 308 of Maran's *Justin*), quotes lines 108–113 of the passage, attributing them to SIBYLLA, of whom Plato makes mention. **Tertullian** (*Ad Nationes,* **2,** 12) quotes part of the same passage, attributing it to SIBYLLA, "who existed earlier than all literature." This work of Tertullian comes to us much mutilated. It mentioned (**2,** 17) Saturn's reign, if not his arrival in Italy. In the parallel passage of his *Apology* (10), he speaks of Saturn as having, after many wanderings, settled in Italy. According to **Dionysius of Halicarnassus,** "what is now called Italy was SACRED TO THIS GOD (Saturn), and was called by the inhabitants 'Saturnia,' as can be found stated in the SIBYLLINE BOOKS, and other oracles given by the gods." — *Antiq.* **1,** 34. It may be remarked in passing, that Tertullian, in the passage cited of his work *Ad Nationes,* styles the Sibyl's verses "Divine Writings," or Letters. An interesting question would be, whether the *special* worship of Saturn in Italy can be traced in any author of earlier date than the Erythræan lines. The reader will find by returning to note 6 that, in a feast provided for the deities in B. C. 399, Saturn was entirely overlooked. In determining whether this special attention to

one of whom, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, is an early one. The object of the Erythræan writer was, probably, to explain the origin of idolatry by attributing it to a human misapprehension. Tertullian and Lactantius use the Sibylline narrative for the same object.

Besides the above there is extant what I take to be a fragment — with alterations, perhaps — from this Erythræan story about Saturn.[50] Virgil, in his mention of the Saturnian kingdoms, must have had in view the Erythræan passage.[51]

Saturn in Italy were a perversion of some Jewish teaching, it is at least noteworthy that the annual offerings to him were on the day of the Jewish passover (see Dionysius of Halicarnas. **1**, 38; Vol. **1**, p. 97), and that part of the ceremony might have originated (compare pp. 151, 152) from a direction to throw away images. Dionysius recognizes it as something distinct from either Roman or Greek customs.

[50] It follows the narrative of the flood in Book **1**, and is in part as follows: —

> "Three high-minded kings,
> Most upright of mankind, shall apportion [men's] lot,
> And govern many a year, meting out justice
> To men fond of labor and of lovely works.
> The productive earth shall smile again with many
> Spontaneous fruits, an over-harvest for posterity.
> But these progenitors, untouched in all their days by age,
> Shall be free from diseases and chill-fevers.
> They shall die overcome by sleep, and depart
> To Acheron in the abodes of Hades, and there
> Shall have honor because they were a race of 'THE BLESSED.'
> Happy men to whom Sabaoth gave good understanding."
>
> **Sibyl. Orac. 1**, 293-304.

After these, according to the same passage, came the Titans. The whole account (lines 291-323) is followed by a portion of Christian origin. I suppose that the author of this latter prefixed from the Erythræan verses the account of the creation and the flood (lines 1-290) as a means of procuring greater credence for his work, and the intermediate lines are probably an attempted condensation of some Erythræan ideas which he did not care to copy at length.

[51] See, under Part E, the quotation from his fourth Eclogue. There is in Hesiod's "Works and Days" an account of consecutive ages named after the metals. The "golden" age is represented as the earliest, and as coincident with Saturn's reign IN HEAVEN. Smith's *Dict. of Biog.* in its article on *Hesiod* (p. 441), treats this account, beginning with line 109 of Book **1**, as being the second of three interpolations. I have no means of determining whether it be of earlier or later date than the Erythræan document. But that Virgil had in mind the latter composition is obvious from the following considerations. He connects his reference with a mention of the Sibyl, or of Cumæan song. He speaks of Saturnian kingdoms in the plural, which agrees with the Sibylline idea of three kingdoms, but with nothing in the "Works and Days." He

Part D.

To this portion I assign whatever in the production related to man's history after the rise of idolatry and before the establishment of God's kingdom. The style of the writer, which in Parts B and C was narrative, becomes in the present portion predictive.

In lines 248–294 of Book **3** is foretold the exit of the Jews from Egypt; also their captivity at a later date and the destruction of their temple because of their idolatry; and the subsequent restoration of that building. The fragment has a somewhat imperfect appearance. The original passage, which it partially represents, would fit naturally into the Erythræan composition, and probably belonged to it.

As regards heathen nations, there is a passage concerning Troy to which we shall shortly pay attention; but with this exception no other part of the Erythræan verses seems to have suffered more at the hands of time. Lack of interest in this portion might account for its not having been copied by the Christians; but a special reason for neglecting it probably existed, which I will endeavor to unfold. Cicero, who seems to have adopted the then common view, which identified divine inspiration with divinely caused insanity, argues against the inspiration of the Erythræan composition on two grounds; namely, that it was methodical and that it contained acrostics.[52] Further, an extant passage in the Oracles renders it

---

quotes a condition of things mentioned in the Sibylline verses, but not in those attributed to Hesiod. A "golden age" is mentioned, **Sibyl. Orac. 1**, 283, 284.

[52] **Cicero**, in the first book of his work on *Divination*, puts into the mouth of his brother the current arguments in behalf of popular belief, and in the second book gives, in his own person, answers thereto. In Book **1** (18), 34, his brother is represented as attributing foreknowledge to the Erythræan Sibyl. In Book **2** (54), 110, 111, Cicero responds: "Let us examine Sibylla's verses, which she is said to have poured out during a frenzy. . . . That that song is not the production of a frenzied person, both the poem itself indicates (for it is more a work of art and diligence than of excitement and impulse) and also that [peculiarity] which is called an acrostic, in which something is connected in regular order by the first letter of the verses [*as in certain compositions of Ennius, which Ennius made*]. That certainly is the work of an attentive rather than of a frenzied mind. But in the Sibylline verses, from the first verse of any paragraph, a whole song is [consecutively] woven together by means of the first letters of that paragraph. This is the work of an author, not of a frenzied person; the work of a laborious mind, not of a crazy one."

probable that these acrostics were in that portion which predicted the fate of nations.[53] Still further, acrostics after the time of Cicero and Varro came to be regarded as evincing the spurious character (whatever that might mean) of any Sibylline composition in which they were found. A natural consequence was, that whoever wished to use Sibylline verses as an authority, would be anxious that they should neither contain, nor be connected with, acrostics. Not one of the acrostics extant in the days of Cicero and Varro has come down to us.

In two passages of the extant Oracles (**3**, 159 – 161, and **8**, 6 – 8) only three lines are allowed to the aggregate of consecutive nations. In two other passages (**4**, 49 – 151, and **9** (or **11**), 9 – 314) more space is devoted to the subject. But a critical examination will evince that the major part of these passages cannot have been Erythræan, and will create distrust of such origin for anything in them unless in so far as it may be substantiated by other evidence.

There is, however, a duplicate subject contained in Book **9** (or **11**), which, as regards one or both of its parts, reappears in more than one passage of the extant oracles,[54] and which excited much attention in the heathen world.[55] One part of

---

[53] The commencement of Book **11** (numbered **9** by Friedlieb), after a brief allusion to the flood, the tower of Babel, and the dissensions after its fall, adds: —

> "From the date of these events the whole earth was divided
> Among different nations and all kinds of dialects,
> Whose numbers I will tell and will name them in acrostics
> Of the initial letter, and will make their name obvious."
> **Sibyl. Orac. 9** (**11**), 15 - 18.

If the account of nations, following upon this statement, was originally written in acrostics, it must have been rewritten so as to eliminate them.

Theophilus, in his quotation (*Ad Autol.* **2**, 31) concerning the tower of Babel, the confusion of tongues, and the distribution into nations, ends — if we reject what has no manuscript authority — with that line of the foregoing which precedes a mention of acrostics, adding, "AND SO FORTH." I am not without suspicion that the last three words may have been intended to throw his heathen readers off their guard. A knowledge that the quoted work contained acrostics would have destroyed its authority.

[54] **Sibyl. Orac. 3**, 414 – 432; **7**, 51 – 54; **9** (or **11**), 122 – 171. Compare **3**, 206; **5**, 8, 9; **12**, 8, 9.

[55] Varro in his enumeration of the Sibyls connects with his mention of the Erythræan this passage alone concerning Troy and Homer; and his statement renders evident that Apollodorus had given prominence to the same before him. Such heathens as wished to claim for a Sibyl of their own faith, or such Greeks as wished to claim for one of their own

this subject is Troy's destruction. The other is an allegation that Homer would tell falsehoods. To avoid presenting the subject in too disjointed a manner, I will state my own supposition as to the purport of the Erythræan passage, and will then lay before the reader the evidence, direct or indirect, for the different points contained in it.

I suppose that the Erythræan writer represented in the guise of a prediction that Troy would be destroyed for its idolatry; that Æneas, a genuine monotheist, would be preserved; that he would, in escaping, act as became a true monotheist, by caring for an aged parent, whom he would bear on his shoulders, and for his child, whom he would lead by the hand; that after seven years' wandering he would found a new dynasty in Italy; that Homer would copy Sibylla's verse and phraseology; and that he would tell falsehoods by representing that the (heathen) deities aided the combatants around Troy.

The prediction that Troy would be destroyed and that Homer would tell lies is ascribed to the Erythræan Sibyl by Apollodorus, a citizen of Erythræ, who was cotemporary with the forgery.[56] The monotheism and seven years' wan-

---

country, the renown of being most distinguished, were sure to specify that their favorite was the one who had predicted touching Troy, or had lived prior to the Trojan war. See Pausanias in *Phocicis and Solinus Polyhistor*, ch. 8, quoted by Opsopœus, pp. 73, 127; also Suidas touching the Delphic Sibyl (in Vol. **3** of his Lexicon, on p. 309), which was of course copied from some heathen authority; also Diodorus Siculus, Book **4**, near the middle of ch. 4. Compare, also, in note 63, what is said by Dio Chrysostom.

[56] A passage from **Varro** concerning the Sibyls has been preserved by Lactantius, in which the former writer says of the Erythræan: "Whom Apollodorus of Erythræ affirms to have been of his own city and to have prophesied to (?) the Greeks when on their way to Ilium, that Troy would perish and that Homer would write falsehoods." — **Lact.** *Div. Inst.* **1**, 6.

I suspect that Varro, whose voluminous reading implies that he read hastily, may have mistranslated from Apollodorus. The latter may have written, "She foretold that Troy would be captured by Greeks in an expedition against Ilium." My reason for suspecting thus much of an inaccuracy in Varro is that traces exist in the oracles and outside of them of an assumed prediction concerning Helen, as the cause of the war, who should arise out of Sparta. This would imply that the prediction assumed to have been uttered before the war broke out. See Pausanias (a writer of the second century) *in Phocicis*, on p. 72 of Opsopœus. Compare also **Sibyl. Orac. 3**, 414; **9**, 125.

There is yet one other suggestion on which the reader may wish to exercise his own judgment, and which, therefore, I will lay before him.

dering of Æneas are an inference from the following facts. Virgil habitually styles Æneas "the pious," a designation not apparently based on anything in the Æneid. This is the usual, if not universal, translation, or mistranslation, of the words θεοσεβής and εὐσεβής, which, in Jewish and Christian Greek, always mean a monotheist and practical monotheist.[57] As Virgil copied largely from the Erythræan verses, it is more likely that the term originated with their author, in whose plan it would have had an object, than with Virgil, in whose work it is without one. Compare on this head extracts in foot-note 60.

A similar remark applies to the seven years' wandering of Æneas. Virgil's narrative does not call for, and can scarcely be reconciled with, such a lapse of time.[58] The number seven, moreover, was not likely to be adopted *without special reason*, by a heathen. But if it originated with a Jew, then it was precisely the one most likely to be adopted for anything indefinite.

That the destruction of Troy was attributed to its idolatry rests on the probability that an extant passage to that effect in

---

According to Suidas, under the word *Ilion*, Vol. **2**, pp. 114, 115, the Erythræan Sibyl was in Greece when the Argonauts sailed. These worthies were reputed in other accounts to have performed on their outward voyage at Troy, near Erythræ, one of their notable exploits (Valer. Flaccus, **2**, 451–549), and to have come back over the Erythræan sea. This sea was, to be sure, nowhere near Erythræ, yet the two statements raise the following question: Did the Erythræan forger represent his prediction concerning Troy as having been made to the Argonauts on their expedition? This would, according to the then popular views, have placed the prediction at a date about one or two generations before the destruction of Troy, and somewhat later than the time of Saturn. This date would not conflict with the style of the Erythræan writer, which is narrative in Saturn's time, and predictive afterwards.

[57] See in this Appendix, Note B, § 1, Nos. 2 and 5.

[58] In the *Æneid*, **1**, 755, 756, Dido asks Æneas for an account of his wanderings, remarking, that "already the seventh summer bears you a wanderer in all lands and seas." He reached Italy, according to Virgil, in the next spring, which, as he launched in the beginning of summer (*Æneid*, **3**, 8), would make out seven years. The reader will find in the Paris edition of Latin writers by Lemaire, in Excursus 2, appended to the third book of the *Æneid*, an attempt to spread chronologically the events through seven years. On page 453 the writer remarks that events specified by him must have occupied two years, or else the number seven cannot be made out. On the preceding page he treats the launch and departure of Æneas, from "the fields where Troy had stood" (*Æneid*, **3**, 10, 11), as occurring in the second year of his wandering.

the oracles[59] is copied or *imitated* from the Erythræan verses. Also on the coherence of such an idea with the general object of those verses. Also, if the view be accepted that Æneas was represented as a practical-monotheist, on the probability of an antithesis having been made between preservation for a monotheist and destruction for idolaters.

The particulars attending the escape of Æneas appear both in the Sibylline Oracles[60] and in Virgil. They represent that consideration for parents and thoughtfulness for children which are inculcated as religious duties in the Old Testament, but which it would puzzle any one to find taught as part of the religion in which Virgil had been educated. It is out of the question that in this instance a Jew copied and Virgil originated.

The charge that Homer would copy from Sibylla is one which it would seem that the Erythræan forger must necessarily have made in order to avoid having his work charged with plagiarism from that writer. This alone would enable us safely to infer that the extant passage must in this respect resemble something in the Erythræan production. This inference, if affected at all, is strengthened by the fact, that heathen writers, of later date than the Erythræan verses, claim this peculiarity for a *supposed* heathen Sibyl.[61]

---

59 "Troy shall enter, not the wedding, but the tomb, in whose depth
Her brides shall weep because they did not recognize God."
Sibyl. Orac. 7, 52, 53.

60 "There shall be a chief from the race and blood of Assaracus,
A renowned son of heroes, a brave and powerful man.
He shall leave this fire-ravaged [city,]
A fugitive and exile through war's fearful doings,
Bearing on his shoulders his aged parent,
Holding his son by the hand, a deed of true monotheism.
. . . . .
His name shall be tri-syllabic. The [alphabet's] first letter
Will plainly point out this noblest man.
And then he will build the powerful city of the Latins."
Sibyl. Orac. 9 11), 144-155.

Compare with lines 146-149 of the foregoing, Virgil's *Æneid*, **2**, 707, 708, 723, 724. Clement of Alexandria commends (*Pædag.* **3**, 79) the wife of Æneas for keeping herself veiled even when escaping from the burning city. Such commendation must have originated with a Jew rather than a heathen, but, whether with the author of the Erythræan verses, we cannot determine.

61 "And thereafter there shall be a deceitful old author,
. . . . .
He shall write about Troy, but not truthfully,

That Homer's falsehoods should have consisted in his attributing to heathen deities an agency in human events accords, at least, so well with the design of the Erythræan writer that the existing passage to that effect could with greater probability be attributed to him than be regarded as a different application by a later hand, of Homer's mendacity.[62] Additional probability is given to this view by the fact, that Dio Chrysostom, who sympathized with monotheists, and who quoted Sibylla in support of morality, found himself charged with unbelief, because he maintained that Homer told falsehoods. His defence of himself strengthens yet further this supposition.[63]

Yet manifestly in my phraseology and shall use my metre;
For he will first unroll my books with his hands."
Sibyl. Orac. 3, 419-425.

The unmeaning word ὀνομήνῃ, in the last line of the above, needs correction. (The context hardly admits any different sense from that indicated in the parallel line 169 of Book **11** or **9**.) In this latter version of the passage Homer is additionally charged with concealing Sibylla's books. It reads as follows: —

"And thereafter there shall be a wise old bard,
Whom all will style the wisest among mortals;
By whose eminent genius the whole world will be instructed;
For he shall write paragraphs with inventive power,
And he shall write, at times, what is unspeakably beautiful,
Clearly by using my expressions, measure, and phraseology.
For he will first unroll my books and afterwards
Conceal them and no longer show them to mankind."
Sibyl. Orac. 9 (11), 163-170.

From heathen writers we have the following: "She [the daughter of Teiresias, devoted by her captors to the oracle at Delphi] wrote in all kinds of Oracles [things] distinguished by their style of composition, from whom Homer, they say, by appropriating much [of her] phraseology, adorned his own poetry." — **Diodorus Siculus, 4**, 4. In a different author we are told, "Bocchus thinks that the Delphic Sibyl prophesied earlier than the Trojan wars, very many of whose verses he shows that Homer inserted in his work." — **Solinus Polyhistor**, 8, quoted in **Opsopœus**, p. 127.

[62] The **Sibylline Oracles, 3**, 426-430, say of Homer: —

"He will specially deck the heroes of war,
Hector, son of Priam, and Achilles, son of Peleus,
And the others who mingled in warlike works;
And will make the gods bring them assistance, —
Writing all manner of lies for empty-headed mortals."

[63] "Some of the Sophists treat my contradiction of Homer as unbelief [in the heathen deities] . . . but, concerning the deities, all, even his flatterers, confess, in brief, that Homer says nothing true; . . . he represents the gods as grieving and groaning and wounded and almost dying; . . . he does not hesitate to report the speeches of the gods in the dis-

I have not attempted in the foregoing to arrange in its order the history of nations and the account of Troy. I suspect, however, that in addition to the previously mentioned account of the nations, there was one event — briefly alluded to in the extant oracles[64] — which can hardly have been omitted by the Erythræan writer. This was the invasion of Greece by the Gauls, a circumstance the more likely to be noticed as the Gauls had subsequently passed into Asia Minor and made themselves felt in that community.

Part E.

This portion of the Erythræan document treated of God's kingdom; an era of holiness and happiness which the Deity would prepare for his true worshippers. Whether a prominent position therein was, or was not, assigned to a Messiah, is a question which will come up in connection with a passage hereafter to be examined.

Many of the Jews and of the Christians held that this era would last a thousand years, and it was, therefore, called the MILLENNIUM. Whether such a view appeared in the Erythræan lines is a matter of uncertain inference from considerations which I place in the note.[65] I also place there a view of Tertullian on a cognate subject, and one from Virgil, which the reader may wish to compare in this connection.[66]

---

putes which he attributes to them with each other; and not only the public ones in the presence of all the gods, but also the private ones of some among them, as, for example, when Jupiter became incensed against Juno because of the fraud upon and defeat of the Trojans." — **Dio Chrysostom,** *Orat.* **11,** 4–6; Vol. **1,** pp. 311–313.

[64] Sibyl. Orac. **3,** 509, 510.

[65] Virgil certainly copies most of his Jewish ideas from the Erythræan writer. This creates a presumption, though not a certainty, that any Jewish views in his works were from the same source. One view held by Jewish and Christian believers in a millennium, was that at the close of its thousand years the GENERAL resurrection should take place. The shade of Anchises, according to the *Æneid,* **6,** 748–751, teaches (ep. p. 572) that after a THOUSAND YEARS in the Elysian Fields its inmates, a mighty host, are restored to life. Further, the seven ages mentioned under Part F (Sibyl. Orac. **2,** 321) raises the question, whether the author by an age meant one thousand years. This was a common interpretation of the seven days or ages.

[66] **Tertullian,** whose views were by no means always consistent, speaks of the heavenly kingdom as lasting a thousand years, "within which era the resurrection of the saints will be ended, who will rise earlier or later, according to their [individual] deserts." — *Adv. Marcion,* **3,** 24;

The happy era attracted attention from Christian and heathen writers. Lactantius makes six quotations from it, specifying that they are Erythræan, though they do not all agree with the present Sibylline text. The Cohortatio ad Græcos quotes three lines of it as from that "ancient and exceedingly old Sibyl." A quotation by Clement of Alexandria is perhaps from it. Virgil, in his fourth Eclogue, has sufficiently identified it as the source whence he borrows; and Horace has translated portions of it, and burlesqued others. Yet with all these aids it is difficult to separate what is Erythræan from what is not. Passages which Lactantius quotes from other Sibyls are intermixed with the earlier production, owing, I suspect, to the well-intentioned efforts of the Byzantine harmonist.[67] I will endeavor to select some passages of which there can be least doubt, though much which I omit may have belonged to it.

"There shall again be a sacred race of practical-monotheists,
Attentive to the counsels and mind of the Most High,
[*Who shall pay honors round the temple of the Great God*
With libation and with burnt-offering and holy hecatombs,
With sacrifices of well-fed bulls and unmarred rams,
Offering fat flocks of firstling sheep and lambs
As whole burnt-offerings in holiness on the great altar.]
Righteously accepting the law of the Most High, 580
The blessed shall inhabit cities and rich fields,
Being exalted as prophets by the Immortal,
And bearers of great joy to all mortals.[68]

. . . . .

And then [men] shall bend to the Great God, the King
Immortal, their bare knee on the fruitful earth

Opp. p. 499 C. Tertullian, if we may judge from his teachings elsewhere, did not intend that any one should escape without his due share of PUNISHMENT. In Virgil the shade of Anchises explains (*Æneid*, **6**, 737 – 747) that souls are admitted individually from the abodes of suffering into the Elysian Fields, the suffering being treated as purgatorial rather than as a meting out of justice. The passage contains three lines (740 – 742) hereafter to be given under Part F, which are an imitation from the Erythræan composition. Tertullian would have been unlikely to teach for Christian doctrine imaginations of Virgil.

[67] See under Additional Remarks in § v. number 6 of this note what is said concerning this Harmonist.

[68] **Sibyl. Orac. 3**, 573 – 583. These lines, though not specially attested, form a natural introduction, and the only one which I can find for Part E, if we except what is certainly not Erythræan. After line 583 the tense changes, which affords ground for distrusting the Erythræan origin of the next paragraph, the one from which Clement of Alexandria has quoted.

And then God shall give great joy to men ;
For earth and trees and numerous flocks
Shall give true fruit to men,
Of wine and honey and white milk,
And of wheat, the best of all things for mortals.[69]

. . . . .

[Men] shall hymn with sweet voices.
Come, let us bow to the earth, let us invoke
The Immortal King, the Great God, the Most High.
[*Let us send to his temple, for he is the only Potentate.*]
Let us consider the law of God, the Most High,
Which is the most just of all things on earth.
We had wandered from the path of the Immortal ;
With senseless minds we worshipped hand-made works
Of carved idols and of dead men.[70]
But wretched Greece,[70a] curb thy pride,

. . . . .

And serve the Great God, that thou mayst partake of these things.

. . . . .

For earth, mother of all, shall give mortals abundantly
The excellent fruit of wheat, wine, and olive ;
Also sweet honey from heaven, a delightful drink ;
Trees also, the fruit of the fig (?) and fat flocks,
And cattle and choicest lambs, and tender kids.
Fountains shall flow of sweet white milk.
Cities and fat fields shall be filled with good things.
There shall be no sword on the earth, nor noise of battle.
[*The groaning earth shall not quake*]
Nor war, nor yet drought upon the earth ;
Nor famine, nor fruit-destroying hail,
But great peace over the whole earth ;
And king shall befriend king till the end of the age.
A common law over the whole earth
Shall God in the starry heavens give to men,
Touching whatever is done by weak mortals.
For he alone is God, and there is no other.
And he will burn with fire the intractable ferocity of men.

. . . . .

And then he will establish an eternal kingdom
Over men ; a holy law which he once gave
To all practical-monotheists ; he promised to open earth,
And universe ; gates of the blessed, and all joys ;

---

[69] **Sibyl. Orac. 3,** 616–623. Line 618 is omitted as an interpolation. Lactantius quotes 619–623 as Erythræan.

[70] **Sibyl. Orac. 3,** 715–723. The Cohortatio ad Græcos quotes lines 721–723 as Erythræan. As such also line 722 is quoted by Lactantius.

[70a] Greece is perhaps used for heathendom in general. Compare page 151, note 26.

[Promised] Immortal understanding and perpetual rejoicing.[71] 770

. . . . . [72]

And all paths of the plain, and rough hills
And lofty mountains, and raging waves of the sea,
Shall be easy to travel and to sail over in those days ;

---

[71] **Sibyl. Orac. 3,** 732, 740, 743–760, 766–770. I have omitted lines 741, 742, which, in an altered shape, are quoted with line 783 by Lactantius, as belonging to the judgment, the part designated by F. This passage and also the last five lines (787–790, 793) of the quotation which follows it, were in the mind of Horace when he wrote his sixteenth *Epode*. That Epode, if we may judge from its allusion to the civil wars, was written during or after the final struggle of Augustus and Antony; probably in B. C. 30 or 29. At the same date the Jews were fostering at Rome apprehensions of impending calamity, as we may reasonably infer from the Sibylline Oracles, **3,** 46–59, already quoted on pp. 120, 121. The lines of Horace, intended as a satire on the prevailing state of feeling, imitated and burlesqued the above. He alludes to the anticipation, that Rome, which its successive enemies had not conquered, should perish by its own hand, and proposes that those of its inhabitants who had nerve should leave it, adding : —

"First let us swear . . . to direct our sails homeward when . . . tigers may delight to couple with hinds (788), . . . nor the simple herds may dread the brindled lions (790), . . . let us seek the happy plains . . . where the untilled land yearly produces grain, and the unpruned vineyard punctually flourishes [compare note 83], and where the branch of the never-failing olive blossoms forth, and the fig adorns its native tree (743, 744), honey distils from the hollow oaks (745, 746). The light water bounds down from the high mountains with a murmuring pace. There the she-goats come to the milk-pails of their own accord, and the friendly flock return with their udders distended (748) ; nor does the bear growl about the sheepfold (789), nor does the rising ground swell with vipers (793), . . . nor is the fertile seed burned by a dry glebe (750), . . . no contagious distempers hurt the flocks" (753). — **Horace,** *Epode* **16,** lines 25, 26, 31, 33, 42–53, 57, Bohn's trans. In the quotation the numbers designate the lines of the Sibylline Oracles in Book **3,** which seem to have suggested the words of Horace. In some the analogy is decided ; in others it is less so.

[72] The five following lines (771–775) are omitted above. They are corrupted, or interpolated, or both. The latter two of them are quoted by Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* **4,** 6) as Erythræan, so that any interpolation must have taken place before his time : —

> "And from every land [men] shall bring frankincense and gifts
> To the houses (households?) of the Great God, nor shall there be
> Another house (household?) for future men to inquire at
> Save the ONE which God permitted faithful men to enrich,
> For mortals call it the son of the Great God."

In what is left of the Erythræan verses the only recommendations of ritual law and offerings interrupt the sense instead of being necessary to it. I suspect that Jews who, honestly or dishonestly, collected gifts for the temple, may at an early date have interpolated what accorded with their views, or was intended to serve their interests.

For perfect peace shall come on the land of the good,
And the PROPHETS of the Great God shall do away the sword ;
For they shall be judges among mortals,[73] and kings shall be just,
And the wealthy among men shall be just.

. . . . . .

Wolves shall associate with lambs on the mountains.
Lynxes shall eat grass with the stags,
And bears with calves, among all mortals.
The carnivorous lion shall eat straw in the manger,
And dragons nestle with unweaned children."[74]

---

[73] The position here assigned to the prophets is that which afterwards (as early probably as B. C. 63) was, in productions under the name of Sibylla, assigned to the Messiah. It is noteworthy, that neither Lactantius, nor any other writer, quotes from the Erythræan Sibyl any prediction of a Messiah. Could Christians have found such a passage, they would probably have interpreted it as an allusion to Jesus.

[74] **Sibyl. Orac. 3,** 776 – 782, 787 – 790, 793. The last five lines are translated as they stand in Lactantius **7,** 24. Virgil, as already remarked in note 51, borrows, in his fourth Eclogue, from this portion and from Part C. The composition of this Eclogue is placed by Smith's Dictionary in the year B. C. 40, and its hopeful tone is in marked contrast to the despondent feelings of the Romans, which Horace, ten years later, satirized in his sixteenth Epode. Virgil's words are as follows : —

" The last age of Cumæan song now comes;
A mighty order of ages is born anew.
Both the [prophetic] Virgin and Saturnian kingdoms now return.
Now a new progeny is let down from the lofty heavens,
Favor, chaste Lucina, the boy soon to be born,
In whom the Iron age shall cease,
And the Golden one arise in the whole world.

. . . . . .

The kid shall bring home milk-distended udders;
Nor shall the herds fear the great lions;
Cradles shall pour forth grateful flowers.
The serpent shall perish, and the treacherous poisonous herb.

. . . . . .

And the ruddy grape shall hang from uncultivated vines,
And rigid oaks shall distil liquid honey.

. . . . . .

. . . Every region shall bear all things,
The ground shall not be subject to the harrow, nor the vine to the pruning-hook."

Virgil, *Eclog.* **4,** 4 - 10, 21- 24, 29, 30, 39, 40. (Compare note 83.)

The alleged Cumæan production perished in the Capitol, B. C. 83. The Erythræan verses are the only other composition to which, with aid of the passage ascribed to Aristotle, Virgil's opening line can be applied. The term "Virgin," which appears in line 6 of the above, is used by Virgil in the *Æneid* (**7,** 45, 104, 318, 590) to designate Sibylla, in which sense it is doubtless used here. A golden age, and also a sixth age, are mentioned in a mutilated passage of the Sibylline Oracles (**1,** 284) which stands connected, at least, with an Erythræan fragment. (Compare, touching these ages, the remarks in note 51.)

Among the fragments pertaining to God's kingdom appear some lines of a moral rather than doctrinal cast, which I place in the note,[75] being unable to determine their position. Probably they did not form a distinct head, but belonged to some one of the divisions under which I have classed the Erythræan verses.

Part F.

According to Lactantius, one portion of the Erythræan Sibyl must have treated upon the judgment.[76] A passage of that nature still extant seems too long to have belonged to any among the imitations of the Erythræan verses. The remarks, moreover, of two Christian writers hardly admit of reconciliation unless we suppose that this belongs to the Erythræan document. According to Clement of Alexandria, no Sibylline writer can, prior to his time, have written concerning Christ.[77] According to the Cohortatio ad Græcos, the Erythræan Sibyl spoke plainly concerning Christ's second coming,[78] — a somewhat remarkable affirmation when con-

---

[75] These lines are 762–765 of Book **3.** **Lactantius** (*De Ira*, 22) speaks of them thus: The Erythræan Sibyl "in another place enumerating the crimes at which God is especially indignant, introduces these [things]": —

> Fly lawless robbery, serve the living God.
> Keep yourselves from adultery and unnatural lust.
> Nurture your own children; do not murder them;
> For the Immortal is angry at whoever sins thus.

[76] "After these things the Underworld will be opened and the dead will rise: touching whom that king and deity will hold a great judgment, to whom the Supreme Father will give an unlimited power of judging and reigning, concerning which judgment and reign the following is found in the Erythræan Sibyl: —

> "When the destined term of mortals shall arrive
> And the judgment of the Immortal God shall come,
> There shall come upon men a great judgment and government."
> **Lactantius, 7,** 20. Compare the Sibylline Oracles, **3,** 741, 742, 783.

It is noteworthy that Lactantius quotes nothing concerning Christ as the judge.

[77] "Attend to Sibylla, how she makes manifest one God and the things hereafter to take place; and taking Hystaspes, read, and you will find, written much more obviously and plainly, the Son of God." — **Clem. of Alex.** *Strom.* **6,** 43; *Opp.* pp. 761, 762.

[78] "Trust that most ancient and exceedingly old Sibyl, whose books are preserved in the whole world, . . . when she pre-announces CLEARLY and MANIFESTLY concerning that coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which is hereafter to occur, and concerning all things which are hereafter to take place through him." — **Cohortatio ad Græcos,** 38.

nected with the fact that the Cohortatio does not quote this very plain statement. If we suppose that the Sibylline extract, to be quoted after the next paragraph, belonged to the Erythræan verses, and that the writer of the Cohortatio had seen some copy in which the interpolation concerning Christ existed, then we can understand how the two statements should be made concerning the same document; and we can also comprehend why the author of the Cohortatio should have forborne a quotation, since the connection would have betrayed to thinking persons the spuriousness of the passage.

There is yet another consideration, which, so far as it has weight, favors the Erythræan origin of the lines under consideration. Virgil in the sixth book of his Æneid represents Sibylla as guiding Æneas through the abodes of suffering and bliss for the departed. The idea that she had any acquaintance with these abodes could not have been derived from extant remains of the patrician forgery, and must have originated, therefore, with the Erythræan verses, or with some imitation of them. There can scarcely be a doubt that the passage in question was known to Virgil, since at least three lines of it, as will hereafter be seen, reappear in the Æneid. Moreover, a presumption, as remarked in note 65, exists, that any Jewish views in Virgil are from the Erythræan verses. Any argument, therefore, from this presumption favors the Erythræan origin of the lines here translated. They are preceded by a passage which I place in the note,[79] under the supposition that it is from another hand.

---

[79] A possibly spurious passage in the text mentions Moses as clothed in flesh. He, like Elijah, was by some of the Jews regarded as having been bodily translated. The statement, therefore, does not necessarily imply a PHYSICAL resurrection: a doctrine which Christian believers in it never quote from the Erythræan Sibyl, nor, however we may understand it, does the text give any PROMINENCE to such a doctrine. The following lines were probably intended to remedy the omission: —

"But when the angels of God, the Immortal and Imperishable,
Shall come, — Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel, —
They, having knowledge of every man's wicked deeds
Formerly done, shall bring all souls from the rayless darkness
To judgment at the tribunal of God,
The Immortal and Great. For One only is 'Imperishable.'
He is the All-ruler, who will be the Judge of mortals.
Then shall the Heavenly God give to the tenants of the Underworld
Life, spirit, and speech; bones fitted
To all the joints, flesh to all the bodies,
Nerves to the nervous system and blood to all the veins;
The skin also, and the former hair to the crown.

"Then shall the mighty angel, Uriel, break and throw down
The massive fastenings of hard, unbroken adamant
Of the Underworld-gates, unforged [by human hand.]
And shall bring to judgment full of lamentations all shades
Of Idols, especially of the ancient Titans
And of the Giants, and of as many as the flood overwhelmed
And those whom the waves destroyed in the sea
Or whom beasts or reptiles or fowls have devoured:
All these he will call to the tribunal.
And again, those whom the flesh-destroying fire has destroyed,[80]
Even these will he wake and place before God's tribunal.
But when he shall raise the dead, overcoming the Fates,
And Sabaoth Adonai, the lofty thunderer, shall sit
On his heavenly throne and establish the massive pillar [of punishment],
[*There shall come in a cloud to the Imperishable — himself also imperishable,*
Christ in glory with his blameless angels
And shall sit on a great right-hand throne, and judge
The lives of true, and ways of false, monotheists].
Moses, too, shall come, the great friend of the Most High,
Clothed in flesh, and the great Abraham shall come,
Isaac and Jacob, Daniel and Elijah,
Habakkuk and Jonas and those whom the Hebrews slew.
And all the Hebrews since Jeremiah will he collect[81]

The immortally constituted, breathing, moving
Bodies of mortals shall rise in one day."
Sibyl. Orac. 2, 214-227.

For Θεοῦ ἄφθιτοι ἀγγελτῆρες, in the first line, read Θεοῦ ἀφθίτ'οἱ ἀγγελτῆρες. The former reading contradicts line 219.

[80] **Virgil's** conception of punishments seems to have been suggested by the three above-mentioned forms of destruction: "Some are hung suspended before the empty winds [a paraphrase of the idea, exposed to beasts and fowls], from others the infection of wickedness is washed out beneath the whirlpool's depth, or is burnt out with fire." — *Æneid*, **6**, 740-742. After these lines some of Virgil's Jewish theology becomes confused. The few inmates of Elysium (line 744) are a mighty multitude (749). We (743) and they (750) seem identified. The following translation, suggested by Sibyl. Orac. **2**, 331-339, if permissible, would remove the latter difficulty and the seeming identification of Elysium with Purgatory: "Each of us — from the date when we enter Elysium, *exinde* [*ex quo*] . . . *mittimur Elysium*, and when, few in number, we reach its joyful fields — suffers as regards the manes of his relatives, *suos manes* for *manes suorum*, until a long day, with its complete circuit of time, erases the hardened stain." — *Æneid*, **6**, 743-746. The use of the term God in line 749 resembles monotheistic phraseology rather than that of heathenism.

[81] Ὀλέσσει in the text has no meaning which the context will bear. Perhaps we should read λέξει, στήσει, or καλέσσει.

For judgment at the Tribunal, that they may receive suitable treatment
And may pay for what each has done in his mortal life.
And then all shall pass through a flaming river
Of quenchless fire, and the just shall all be saved.
But the Godless shall suffer destruction therein ages long
As many as formerly did wickedly
Or committed murder, and all who were accomplices.
The false and thievish ; the secretly fiendish destroyers of households
Who lurk at the feasts and steal to the nuptial couch, heaping up shamelessness ;
The fiendish and overbearing, whether LAW-less and Idolaters,
Or those who DESERTED the great immortal God
And BECAME blasphemers, and plunderers of true monotheists,
Enemies of the faith and destroyers of holy men ;
Or the deceitful and shamelessly two-faced
Elders and eminent deacons who respect the high.
They decide with deference [to them] doing unjustly to others,
[Judicial] deceivers trusting to, and misled by, rumors.
More destructive than panthers and wolves — the worst of men.
Also the proud and the usurers,
Who heap usury on usury at home
And destroy the orphans and the widows.
Or such as give of their UNJUST gains
To widows and orphans. Or such as in giving of their own substance,
Accompany it with reproaches. And those who desert their parents
In old age, repaying them either nothing, or insufficiently
For their bringing up. Also the disobedient,
And such as use violent language to their parents,
And those who having received a pledge deny it.
Servants, too, that have wronged their masters ;
And again, those who pollute themselves by debauchery,
Or such as have loosed a virgin's girdle
For secret intercourse. Women, too, who procure abortion,
And men who wickedly throw away their offspring.
Sorcerers and sorceresses. The anger of the Heavenly
And incorruptible God shall fasten these and those
To his pillar where, all around,
Flows an inexhaustible river of fire. All alike
Shall the angels of the immortal and eternal God
Punish terribly with flaming scourges and fiery chains,
Binding them down with unbreakable bonds.
Then during the pitch darkness of night
They cast them to the many and fearful
Sub-Tartarean Beasts in Gehenna, where is measureless darkness.
But, when they shall have inflicted many punishments
On all who had an evil heart, thereafter
A fiery whirlpool from the great river shall carry them around,

Because they busied themselves with wicked works.
Then from the distance shall their lamentation arise on every hand
Over their miserable fate; both from fathers and children,
From mothers and their infant sucklings.
There shall be no sufficiency to their tears, nor shall
The compassionate voice of sympathizers be anywhere heard;
But they shall howl, kept in the black darkness
Below Tartarus. In these accursed localities
They shall pay threefold the evil they have perpetrated.
Racked by the sea of fire they shall gnash with their teeth,
Consumed by thirst and by their flaming torment.
They shall call it a blessing to die, but shall not be able.
Neither death nor night shall any longer bring them rest.
They shall vainly pour out supplications to God on high
Who will turn his face unmistakably from them;
For he gave seven ages as time of repentance
To mankind, misled by an unpolluted virgin.[82]
But the others who busied themselves with justice and good works,
With true monotheism and just thoughts,
The angels will bear through the flaming river
And bring them to Light and a Life without care,
Where is the immortal path of the Great God,
And three fountains of wine, honey, and milk;
And the land belongs equally to all with no walls nor enclosures,
And without divisions. It bears superfluous fruits without labor.[83]
Life is in common, and wealth undivided;
For neither poor man nor rich man will be there;
Neither tyrant nor bondsman; nor yet great man nor small;
Nor king nor rulers; but all will be alike.
No one will there say, "Night has come," or, "morning";
Nor, "It happened yesterday." There shall not be multiplied days of care;
Nor spring nor summer; nor winter nor closing autumn;
Nor marriage nor death; nor buying nor selling;
Nor sunset nor sunrise; for [God] will make one long day.[84]

[82] That is, by the virgin Eve. See on this subject *Belief of the First Three Centuries concerning Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, Note H of the Appendix.

[83] Compare with this the words of Horace (*Epode* **16**, 43, 44) quoted on p. 424, and of Virgil (*Eclogue*, **4**, 39, 40) quoted on p. 425.

[84] The above assumes for dwellers on earth in the happy era a source of illumination (compare Rev. **21**, 23) different from that of our sun. Nine lines subsequently the Erythræan writer gives to the Elysian Plain a position (Sibyl. Orac. **2**, 338, 339) on the Acherusian lake, that is, in the underworld. Any subterranean locality for it contradicted heathen views, and must have been suggested by Jewish ideas of Abraham's bosom. Virgil borrows from Judaism (see note 65) its "thousand years" of bliss, but blends the two conceptions above mentioned, thus confusing matters above ground with those below. He places the Elysian Fields (*Æneid*, **6**, 638–641) in the underworld, and gives them a

To these — genuine monotheists — will the universal Ruler,
The Imperishable God, grant another privilege.
When they ask the Imperishable God to save mortals
From the flaming fire and enduring lamentations, he will grant, and do it.
Gathering, he will place them elsewhere, with no remnant of burn
From the raging fire, and will send them for his people's sake
To another and enduring life, to the Immortals,
To the Elysian Plain, where are the broad waters
Of the ever-flowing, deep-bosomed Acherusian lake.
Alas, wretched me! what shall be my fate in that day
Because of my excessive perverseness
Before I was old enough to marry or to have understanding?
Even in the apartments of my wealthy husband
I shut out the needy. I knowingly did wrong.
But, O Preserver, save me from my just torments,
Me, shameless, who committed improprieties.
And now I beseech thee for a little rest from my song,
Holy Manna-giver, King of the great kingdom."[85]

Part G.

This concluding part is attested by two quotations which Lactantius has made from it; by a joint reference of Varro and Lactantius to a passage in it;[86] and by the apparent connec-

sun and stars of their own; thereby, absurdly enough, putting a solar and stellar system inside of the earth. The passage, if isolated, might bear a different interpretation, but lines 680, 762, of the same book, forbid it.

Tertullian in one passage (*Apol.* 47) located Paradise south of the Torrid Zone. This may have been an awkward effort by himself, or by some earlier writer, Jew or Christian, to explain the perennial day. Valerius Flaccus (*Argonaut.* **1**, 844) mentions the fields [Elysian?] where sunshine lasts the whole year. The author's remarks in *Underworld Mission*, 3d edit. pp. 97, 164, need to be conformed to the present note.

[85] **Sibyl. Orac. 2** 228–348. The idea of sympathy for suffering brethren (lines 333, 334), manifested by those in bliss, would compare favorably with a conception which has passed for Christian; namely, that "the sight of hell torments will exalt the happiness of the saints." The reader should, in connection with this passage, recur to the latter part of note 80.

[86] **Lactantius** quotes from **Varro** a passage concerning ten Sibyls, concluding as follows: "The verses of all these Sibyls are circulated and owned [by private individuals] except those of the Cumæan, whose books are by Romans forbidden to the public, nor do they deem their inspection lawful by any except the Quindecemvirs. There are individual books of each of these which, because inscribed with the name of Sibylla, are supposed to belong to one person. They are, moreover, confounded (?), nor can each one's be distinguished and assigned to her, except that of the

tion between another passage and Part B. The opening of it is evidently dependent on some omitted portion which preceded. Two lines, moreover, are said to be wanting where periods have been substituted.

"These things to you when leaving, inspired with divine frenzy,
The long walls of Assyria's Babylon, sent as a fire into Greece,
Proclaiming to all mortals the divine threats.
. . . . .
So that I proclaim Divine secrets to mortals.
And in Greece mortals will call me a foreigner,
BORN AT ERYTHRÆ, and shameless. Some will pronounce
Me, Sibylla, a crazy impostor, born of Circe, my mother,
And her near relative, my father. But when all things shall take place,
Then you will remember me, and no one will longer
Pronounce as mad the Great God's prophetess.
Did he not show me what occurred to my forefathers?
The earliest events God enumerated to me;
And all things subsequent he put into my mind;
So that I proclaim the future and the past
And tell them to mortals. For when the world was whelmed
With waters, and but one approved man was left
Sailing in his hewn-wood house on the waters,
With beasts and fowls, that the world might be filled again,
I was his daughter-in-law,[87] and his relative;
To whom the earliest events happened and all the last were unfolded,
So that by my mouth all these truths should be uttered."[88]

Erythræan who inserted her name in her song, and foretold that she would be called Erythræan, when in reality she came from Babylon." — Varro, quoted in Lactantius, **1**, 6. That these concluding remarks are from Varro and not from Lactantius is shown by the following considerations. In Varro's time the laws were doubtless unrepealed which forbade unauthorized persons to examine the so-called Books of the Cumæan Sibyl. Against the circulation of the other Sibylline writings no law had yet been enacted. In the days of Lactantius, on the contrary, all Sibylline works stood legally on the same footing, being forbidden to the people by unrepealed though unexecuted laws. Again, the statement that all Sibylline writings were supposed to come from one person had, doubtless, a good deal of truth in Varro's time, and little or none in that of Lactantius. If any one should regard the closing words of the passage as from Lactantius, it would then imply that in his day the passage in our text was that which made known the Sibyl's name.

[87] The word translated daughter-in-law means commonly a bride. Its signification here is determined by its use in Part B. Compare note 40.

[88] **Sibyl. Orac. 3**, 808–828. **Lactantius**, whose text I follow, has quoted 812 and 814–817 in his *Institutes*, **1**, 6, and **4**, 15. The statement of what the Sibyl had accomplished should be compared with what she undertook, as stated in note 41. Line 821 is borrowed from the *Iliad*, **1**, 70.

The distinguished reception which the Romans accorded to the Erythræan composition prompted more than one subsequent effusion under the name of Sibylla, its supposed authoress. None of these productions attained the fame or commanded the confidence attached to their original ;[89] nor, as we have already said, was there affixed to any one of them a name by which it could be separately identified. Christians found the Erythræan Sibyl, so far as it agreed with their views, a valuable resource in controversy against heathens. They were debarred in such controversy from using the testimony of their four Gospels, since these were avowedly written by Christians, whose testimony was, of course, not admissible in behalf of Christian allegations.[90] The foregoing document was free from suspicion of Christian authorship, for it existed before the Christian era. It had, moreover, been recognized by the highest authority in Rome as supernatural in its character. Its existence compelled the Roman aristocracy and their adherents, even before the Christian era, to choose between the following courses of action. They could admit its teachings. But this implied that they were to renounce the state religion which was likely to involve their own privileges in its ruin. Or, secondly, they could confess that the whole patrician order had been imposed upon egregiously by a Jew. But such a confession was more likely to diminish than to increase the already waning respect for their order. There was yet a third course, which was to suppress the document and its imitations, so that its contents could no longer be appealed to. This plan (see p. 165) was attempted under Augustus with but partial and temporary success.

---

[89] "Many authors of high standing have written concerning the Sibyls, as Aristo of Chios and Apollodorus of Erythræ among the Greeks ; Varro and Fenestella among our own [countrymen]. All these narrate that the Erythræan was eminent and renowned beyond the others ; Apollodorus, indeed [being prompted thereto], that he might glory in his own city and people." — **Lactantius**, *De Ira*, 22. The mention by **Strabo**, of "the old Erythræan Sibyl" (**17**, 1, 43; compare **14**, 1, 34) implies at least that he also placed no other on a par with her.

[90] Obvious as the truth of the above remark might seem, no ecclesiastical history has called attention to it. Had Christians forged the Gospels, they would have attributed them to Jewish or heathen authors.

§ III. *Sibylline Compositions, B. C. 75 to A. D. 200, were Jewish.*

The compositions under the name of Sibylla during three centuries after the Erythræan forgery were, with one exception, Jewish. To this exception, a piece of but thirty-seven lines, fabricated doubtless at the instigation of the aristocracy, we shall hereafter devote some remarks. Its most appropriate designation would be "Patrician Opposition Lines," and this is the heading under which we shall recur to it.[91] The Christians in a few instances interpolated a line or more into the Jewish documents which they found ready made to their hand, but anything which can be called a Christian composition did not originate before A. D. 200 or 250. For the sake of perspicuity the discussion of this point will be reserved for a separate head.[92] We will begin with the considerations which imply a Jewish origin for these productions, and will afterwards examine any supposed heathen claims.

FIRSTLY: Several books of Sibylline oracles have come down to us, none of which bear marks, either wholly or in part, of heathen origin.

SECONDLY: Lactantius, in the beginning of the fourth century, lived at a time when it was not yet in the power of Christians to have destroyed any heathen Sibylline literature. He regarded himself as confronted by persons intelligent enough and sufficiently conversant with the subject to recognize at once when he quoted Sibylline verses of Christian origin (*Div. Inst.* **4,** 15), and he had himself made the subject a special study. Occupying this position he quotes the statement of Varro concerning the Sibyls, among whom only the Erythræan could be singled out, and adds, "ALL THESE SIBYLS, IN FINE, TEACH ONE GOD."[93] We cannot suppose that he knew of heathen Sibylline verses, but trusted to the ignorance or silence of his opponents, nor can we suppose that he was himself uninformed on the subject.

THIRDLY: The quotations from, the allusions to, and the statements concerning the Sibylline Oracles in Cicero and Varro, nearly half a century before, and in Dio Chrysostom a century after the Christian era, imply or favor their Jewish origin. Thus, Varro, in a work, published from 47 to 45 B. C.,

---

[91] See § VI. of this Note A.

[92] See § IV. of this Note A.

[93] Lact. **1,** 6.

speaks of the Sibylline writings then afloat as not unfrequently marked by a peculiarity which Cicero attributes also to the verses from Erythræ, namely, that they contained acrostics.[94] If in connection with this we consider that the Old Testament contains twelve acrostics,[95] and that extant heathen literature contains none, it at least favors the Jewish origin of the documents in question.

Again, the anticipation of a "Coming Kingdom," or a "Kingdom from the East," was Jewish; the association of this anticipation with that of a general conflagration was also Jewish. Further, heathens treated the idea of a general conflagration as a matter of reasoning and speculation; but in the Sibylline verses which have come down to us it is purely a matter of PREDICTION unsupported by reasoning. The deluge is also predicted by Noah to his cotemporaries. If we now turn to **Cicero,** we find in the very work which discusses Sibylline pretensions, that he puts into the mouth of his brother Quintus a recognition and defence of foreknowledge[96]

---

[94] **Varro's** *Antiquities of Things Divine* constituted the latter half of his "Antiquities," and if (?) addressed to Caius (Julius) Cæsar, it must have been written before Cæsar's assassination in March, B. C. 44, and doubtless later than the battle of Pharsalia in August, B. C. 48. The following seems to be a restatement from it rather than a quotation: "The present Books are collected from many places, some being brought from cities in Italy, others from Erythræ in Asia, envoys being sent by a decree of the Senate to copy them, and yet others from other cities and copied by private individuals, among which are found interpolations of the Sibylline Books, which can be recognized by what are called Acrostics. I am but stating what Terentius Varro has narrated in his Theological Treatise." — **Dionys. Halicar. 4,** 62; Vol. **2,** p. 793. The dedication to Cæsar may have been a political forgery.

[95] These acrostics are all alphabetical: namely, Psalms **25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119,** and **145**; also Proverbs, chapter **31,** verses 10–31, being the praises of a good wife; also each of the first four chapters of Lamentations. The reader who wishes additional information may consult Noyes, Translation of Psalms, Introduct. pp. 47–50, and in Lowth, translation of Isaiah, Prelim. Dissert. pp. iv–ix, Boston edit. 1834; also Blayney, *Introduct. to Lamentations,* and note on chapter **2,** verses 16, 17, of the same.

[96] "There is a certain class of them [that is, persons gifted by nature with foreknowledge] who call themselves away from the body and are borne by their whole care and thought to the knowledge of divine things. Their auguries are not the result of a divine impulse, but of human reason [by which must be understood, not reasoning, but natural endowment], since by [their] nature they have a PRIOR CONSCIOUSNESS of future events, as of floods and of the conflagration of heaven and earth which will take place at some future time. Others, specially skilled

illustrated by those who foreknow floods, the general conflagration, and a "Coming Kingdom," or else a "Kingdom from the East." If there could be any question as to what **Cicero** had in mind, it would seem to be dispelled by the allusion elsewhere[97] to foreknowledge as "THE PROPHETIC OLD WOMAN of the Stoics." If we suppose that all this refers to Jewish Sibylline writers, it becomes comprehensible and natural enough; but on any other supposition it is an inexplicable enigma. The relation, moreover, of Stoic to Jewish belief[98] strengthens the former supposition.

Again, Cicero, in a passage from which a quotation will appear in note 99, speaks of Sibylla as "exciting superstitouching public things (as we have heard concerning the Athenian Solon), FORESEE a kingdom from the East, *orientem tyrannidem*, long beforehand." — *De Divinatione*, **1** (49), 111. Orientem is here used, probably, as in Horace (Book **1**, *Ode* 12, line 55, *orientis oræ*) for eastern. Its original signification, *rising*, is inapplicable to a kingdom "long before" its existence. Quintus, availing himself of a twofold signification of the word, supports the believers in a predicted Kingdom from the East by the authority of Solon, who noticed (not foresaw) earlier than others (not earlier than its commencement) a growing regal power, *qui Pisistrati tyrannidem primus vidit orientem* (*Valer. Max.* **5**, 3). In order, however, to avoid risk of placing more stress on the argument than it will certainly bear, the reader will find in the text an alternate translation "coming kingdom" as preferable, for the reason already stated to "rising kingdom." He should in this connection examine the following Sibylline passage. The absence from it of any bitterness towards the Romans indicates that it was one of the earlier productions, possibly prior to B. C. 63, and almost certainly as old as Cicero's work on *Divination*.

> "And then God will send a King from the East,
> Who shall cause the whole earth to cease from wicked war,
> By killing some, and administering binding oaths to others.
> Nor shall he do these things by his own counsels,
> But by obeying the excellent rules of the Great God.
> And 'The People' of the Great God shall again shine,
> Loaded with wealth, with gold and silver
> And fine purple. The earth shall be fruitful,
> The sea full of good things. And kings,
> Guarding against wicked-minded anger towards each other,
> Shall begin: 'Envy is not good for miserable mortals.'"
>
> **Sibyl. Orac. 3**, 652-662.

In the foregoing I surmise that περικαλλεῖ may have been intended by its Jewish author as a verb. The sense will be essentially the same, if it be deemed an adjective. Lactantius (**7**, 18) quotes the first two lines as from another Sibyl, — that is, not the Erythræan. With the above extract may be compared a passage (Sibyl. Orac. **3**, 46 sqq.) already quoted on pp. 120, 121.

[97] Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, **1** (8), 18; cp. **2** (29), 73.

[98] See, in the body of this work, Ch. III.

tious fears." This would at least *accord* with the supposition that these writings were Jewish, such as have come down to us. It *does not harmonize* with the idea that they resembled anything extant, or known to have existed formerly in heathen literature. Cicero refers evidently not to documents floating among the people, but to those in the public collection.

Again, Jewish teaching, in extant Sibylline verses, treats the Deity as the real ruler or king of mankind, and enjoins on men that if they would be saved, they should recognize or address him as such. Cicero, in a work finished in B. C. 44 or 43, mentions an expectation as preceding the assassination of Julius Cæsar, namely, that the interpreter of the Sibylline writings was about to say in the Senate, "He who was our real king should be called king, if we wished TO BE SAVED."[99] A passage still extant would need no very forced translation to give this meaning, though it lacks the concluding expression, which I suppose to be a translation of the Greek word *σωθῆναι*, technical as a theological term among both Jews and Christians.[100]

---

[99] "Let us observe the verses of Sibylla, which she is said to have poured out during a frenzy, the interpreter of which writings it was lately thought, in accordance with a FALSE report, was about to say in the Senate that 'He who was our real king should be called king, if we wished to be saved.' If this be in these books, to what man and to what time does it refer? . . . Wherefore let us lay away Sibylla and keep her hid, so that, as delivered to us by our ancestors, her books may not even be read without command of the Senate, and may be efficacious in ALLAYING rather than EXCITING superstitious fears. Let us deal with the guardians of these books that they should produce from them anything rather than a king whom henceforth neither men nor gods will tolerate at Rome." — **Cicero**, *De Divinatione*, **2** (54), 110–112.

The work on *Divination* (**1**, 119) mentions the death of Cæsar, and was written, therefore, as late as 44 B. C. Cicero was killed in the following year, so that the work cannot have been later than 43 B. C.

[100] The **Sibylline Oracles**, **3**, 560, 561, might bear the mistranslation: —

"Mortals shall begin to call their great defender a king,
And to query [touching] their great deliverer, what position he should hold."

The correct meaning can, however, be seen in their connection.

"But when the anger of the Great God shall be upon you
Then you shall recognize the countenance of the Great God.
All souls of men in the depth of their affliction,
Stretching their hands to the broad heaven,
Shall begin to call the Great King 'their Preserver,'
And to seek [concerning] their deliverer from the wrath, 'who he may be?'"

Again, portions of the Old Testament teach that a right life is better than sacrifice or offering.[101] It would be difficult to find a similar idea in heathen writers who were uninfluenced by Judaism or Christianity. But Dio Chrysostom, who was influenced by both, appends to such teaching the statement that it accorded with what could be found in Sibylla.[102]

Among dialogues in what are styled "Plutarch's Morals" is one containing an allusion to "Sibylla of the insane [that is, prophetic] voice," as "speaking things which awaken no mirth, and are devoid of paint or perfumery."[103] The remark, though not very definite, ought not in this connection to be omitted, since it agrees with the character of extant Sibylline verses, but would be inapplicable to any class of heathen poetry. The same passage mentions one thousand years as Sibylla's lifetime; a duration suggested probably by the Erythræan narrative. A different passage of the same dialogue alludes to the destruction and transplanting of Greek cities, the irruption of barbarians and overturning of empires as contained in the Sibylline verses, and asks whether the late events at Cumæ and Dicæarchia (the eruption of Vesuvius, A. D. 79) had not been predicted in them.[104] Existing Sibylline fragments leave little doubt that we have remains of the passages to which the speaker referred.[105]

FOURTHLY: In the intermediate period between Cicero and Dio Chrysostom we have found that governmental action against Sibylline writings was coincident with that against Jews; also that singing of a supposed Sibylline verse was followed in one instance by senatorial action against the Jews, and in a second instance by a rebellion in Judæa.[106] Nor should it be over-

---

[101] "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." — **Ps. 51**, 17. "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense; and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice." — **Ps. 141**, 2. "To do justice and equity is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice." — **Prov. 21**, 3. Compare on p. 22, Is. **1**, 10 – 18; and on p. 392, Ps. **40**, 6; Hosea **6**, 6.

[102] See close of note 130.

[103] **De Pythiæ Oraculis**, Plutarch's Works, Vol. **7**, p. 561.

[104] **De Pythiæ Oraculis**, Plutarch's Works, Vol. **7**, p. 567.

[105] The allusion to Cumæ and to the eruption of ashes is in the Sibylline Oracles, Book **5**, lines 308 – 315. The irruption of barbarians is mentioned Book **3**, lines 520 – 536. The destruction of cities is to be found in many passages.

[106] See pp. 164, 165, 188, 189, 243, 244.

looked in this connection, that the verse agreed not with the Etruscan idea of a nation's fall at the close of its tenth age, but with the Jewish peculiarity that Rome's fall should occur at the *beginning* of the tenth age, or when thrice three hundred years had been numbered.

If we now examine the allegations of heathen authorship for Sibylline writings, they may be divided into two classes. One of these belongs to and is treated under another head.[107] It is the allegation by Christians, after the Jewish rebellion under Hadrian, of a heathen authorship for the Erythræan or other OBVIOUSLY JEWISH verses which they quote. As the verses are not by a heathen, they need no discussion here. The other class consists of implications or allegations in heathen authors. Thus, Virgil speaks of Sibylla as a priestess of Apollo. In his case we can identify as Jewish the document which he uses. He was patronized by Augustus, and must have been prompted either by deference for the emperor or by some other bias, to claim for Apollo's priestess the established prestige of the Erythræan composition. No such claim, it may be remarked, seems to have been made in behalf of the original patrician forgery. The earliest QUOTATION of heathen verses in connection with, or bearing upon, the allegation which we are considering, was in the second century. Only two or three such quotations exist. None of them justify the supposition that heathen documents of a Sibylline character were afloat.[108] A single one of them has been used by Clement

---

[107] See Ch. XI. § I. 2 ; also the present Note § V. 5, and § VIII.

[108] A passage from **Pausanias** *in Phocicis*, cited by **Opsopœus** in his collection of the Sibylline Oracles, pp. 72 – 83, contains two assumed quotations from Sibylla of four and six lines respectively (pp. 75, 76 – 78). The latter of these is obviously an epitaph, which could not have formed part of a published document. It originated, doubtless, in the desire of some heathens at Troas to claim, by the erection of a monument, that Sibylla was there buried. The epitaph begins : —

> " I am Sibylla, the interpreter of Phœbus,
> To be inquired of under this stone monument;
> Formerly a speaking virgin, now eternally silent."

The other, or first-mentioned quotation, consists of four lines, of which the last one was, according to Solinus (in *Opsopœus*, p. 79), rejected by the Erythræans ; probably because it assigned the neighborhood of Troy (Troas) as the birthplace of Sibylla. The whole four may have been merely another portion of the epitaph already mentioned. They read as follows, the first two admitting an accurate, and the last two a somewhat conjectural, translation : —

> " I am born half of mortal, half of immortal parentage,
> Of an immortal nymph and a fish-eating [fisherman (?)] father;

of Alexandria, and therefore calls for a word of explanation touching his views, without which his use of it might seem incomprehensible. To avoid encumbering the text, I transfer the remarks upon it to a note.[109]

Descended on the mother's side from moisture [or heat, Ἰδογενὴς] my country is red
Marpessus. The river Aidoneus is sacred to my mother."

The omission by the Erythræans of the fourth line would have left for conclusion of the third "my country is Erythræ," and would also have obviated one or two grammatical difficulties. Perhaps the first three lines originated among heathens at Erythræ, and the fourth may have been added by inhabitants of Troas so as to accommodate the sentiment — whether for an epitaph or otherwise — to their locality. The Erythræans maintained that the nymph's name was Idæa (Solinus, quoted by Opsopœus, p. 79), and must probably have attributed this meaning to Ἰδογενὴς. Solinus understood the same word as meaning that Sibylla's mother was a nymph of Mt. Ida. He identifies Sibylla with Herophile (concerning whom see ADDITIONAL REMARKS in § v.), and ascribes to her the prediction concerning Troy. Both of these peculiarities accord well enough with the effort to claim for a heathen authoress the prestige of the Erythræan verses, but fail to indicate the existence of Delphic or other heathen Sibylline documents.

[109] **Solinus Polyhistor** says of Herophile or Sibylla, whose epitaph has already been given, that "the people of Delphi make mention of her hymns to Apollo." — *Opsopœus*, p. 72. It would seem a reasonable inference from this, that outside of Delphi little was known of them. **Clement of Alexandria** has preserved three heathen lines, extant, possibly, at Delphi, which will become more intelligible by a further quotation from **Solinus** in direct continuation of the above, to the effect that the lady "calls herself not only Herophile, but Diana in her verses [in these hymns (?)], and alleges herself the wife, and again, the sister, and again, the daughter of Apollo," for which rather inconsistent professions Solinus apologizes by adding, "These things she did in her insanity when possessed by the god." The hymn preserved by Clement is as follows: —

> "O Delphians, servants of far-shooting Apollo!
> I have come to utter the mind of ægis-bearing Jove,
> Having become angry at my brother Apollo."
>
> **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* 1 (21), 108; edit. Pott. p. 384.

It seems probable from the above that some of the people at Delphi, whose oracle had now been silent for about two centuries, must have endeavored to indemnify themselves by manufacturing occasionally a fugitive verse which CLAIMED by implication a residence of Sibylla in their neighborhood. There are no indications at Delphi or elsewhere of heathen Sibylline productions to a greater extent than this.

Clement was not indifferent to idolatry. He may, in enumerating the Sibyls, have copied the lines without appreciating their bearing, — for he was not a critical writer, — or he may have shared the view given in the Lexicon of Suidas under the heads of "APOLLO" and "JUPITER'S VOICE," that "Apollo is a Prophet of the Father."

§ IV. *Christian Compositions were later than A. D.* 200.

In our present collection of Sibylline Books are two portions of Christian origin to whose general character we shall hereafter devote some examination. These have been erroneously regarded as productions of the first century, or at latest, of an early date in the second. Writers of high standing have adopted and propagated this mistake. In a note of Maran to the Cohortatio ad Græcos, quoted into Otto's edition without mark of dissent, the position is assumed as not admitting question, that our present Sibylline verses of Christian origin were already in existence before the Cohortatio was written.[110] A critical examination of the passage to which the note is appended will convince a person familiar with early Christian discussions that the reverse inference is probable. Extant Sibylline DOCUMENTS of Christian origin contain, if we except one acrostic, predictions of Christ's doings and sufferings UPON EARTH, but the passage in the Cohortatio alludes only to a prediction of his YET FUTURE coming, to which we have already called attention.[111] Further, the absence from the Cohortatio and from all other Christian authors in the second century of any quotation from, or allusion to, Sibylline predictions of Christ's doings or sufferings UPON EARTH, implies that they knew of no such writings. The earliest mention of, or quotation from, them is at the end of the third century, or the beginning of the fourth, in Lactantius.

I am not unaware that Gibbon,[112] has attributed to Tertul-

---

[110] "From these words we can determine with certainty that already, at the date when Justin wrote, a digest into one collection had been made, if not of all the Sibylline Books such as we now have them, yet at least of those portions which contain a clear and plain prediction concerning Christ's advent, and concerning all things which he should do. Justin, indeed, had no suspicion how every page of these books proclaims a fraud." — **Maran**, quoted by **Otto**, under **Cohortat. ad Græc.** 38, in note 8. The passage, — a short interpolation, — which in all probability the author of the Cohortatio had in mind, has been given italicized in brackets on page 428, preceded by some remarks on p. 427. It could not refer to the life of Jesus on earth. Its selection, moreover, to the exclusion of any other concerning Jesus, implies that the writer knew no other Sibylline passage which predicted the Gospel narrative.

[111] See (as in preceding note) pp. 426, 427, 428, especially note 77. The interpolation on p. 428 mentions Christ distinctly. The acrostic does not.

[112] "When Tertullian assures the Pagans that the mention of the prodigy is found in *Arcanis* (not *Archivis*) *vestris* (see his *Apology*, 21), he

lian a mention of these Christian oracles. The method by which he misled himself can be more readily explained if a previous word be bestowed on the object of Tertullian's statement. Christian controversialists in their disputes with heathens were sorely embarrassed by the fact that the four narrations of their Master's life, commonly in use, bore the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, persons universally recognized as Christians. Since, however, Christian writers could not be quoted in behalf of Christian allegations, a forgery had been perpetrated which was intended to remedy this difficulty. It was called Pilate's Report. **Tertullian,** in speaking of the darkness at the crucifixion, says to the heathens: "At the same moment [when he died] daylight disappeared, though the sun was at its height. Those deemed it an eclipse who were ignorant that IT ALSO had been foretold concerning Christ; and yet you have recorded in your archives that accident to the world. . . . Pilate, who as regarded his own convictions was already a Christian, announced at that time all those things concerning Christ to Tiberius."[113] There can be no doubt that he had in mind the pretended Report. Of course no such document existed in the PUBLIC archives of Rome, and some Christian probably noted as an explanation in the margin of Tertullian's Apology the word "secret," meaning that the Report had been hidden among SECRET archives. Some transcriber has mistaken this marginal addition as a SUBSTITUTE for archives, an error which could happen in the Latin though not in the English, since in the former language it may mean "Secret Things." Gibbon adopts this reading, interprets it as meaning the Sibylline verses, and says, erroneously, that they RELATE the darkness attendant on the crucifixion exactly in the words of the Gospel. Tertullian cannot possibly have referred to the Sibylline Oracles, since they contain no narrative whatever of the crucifixion or darkness. What they do contain is a PREDICTION that such events would take place. But what Tertullian

---

probably appeals to the Sibylline Verses, which relate it exactly in the words of the Gospel." — **Gibbon**, c. 15, foot-note 196. The erroneous reading Arcanis, though found in but one manuscript, is adopted by several editors of Tertullian's works.

[113] Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 21. In Pilate's Report the mention of this darkness (Thilo, *Codex Apoc.* pp. 110, 111) is accompanied by the information that the moon was then full, which would, of course, render a natural eclipse of the sun impossible.

needed was historical evidence that they had taken place, and his reference is not to a prediction, but to a historical narration.

The Sibylline verses of Christian origin are not voluminous. A slight classification, however, will aid the reader in comprehending them. Three pieces contain predictions of Christ's life and doings on earth. One of these, Book **1**, lines 324 – 400, is somewhat awkwardly connected in our present copies with that portion of the Erythræan verses which I have designated by B. The lines which connect it therewith may have been an addition to, or an attempted condensation of, ideas in the Erythræan document. The object of this connection must have been to obtain currency for the Christian forgery.

Another of these pieces, twenty-eight lines long, constitutes the whole of Book **6**, and stands disconnected from anything else.

The remaining prediction of Christ's life on earth is in Book **8**, lines 256 – 323. This stands at present in tolerably close sequence upon an acrostic concerning the judgment. It is, of course, chronologically out of place as a sequence upon that event. Its present position may have been owing to an occurrence of the word "judgment" in its first line, or it may have originated with the author of lines 244 – 255, to which we will subsequently recur.

Placing in the note [114] an account of smaller portions which

---

[114] Aside from the interpolation (Book **2**, 242 – 245) already mentioned, there are two lines (Book **5**, 48, 49) commendatory of Hadrian which must have originated with a Christian.

The address to Jerusalem (Book **8**, 324 – 336), which begins, —

> "Rejoice, sacred and much-suffering daughter of Zion,
> Thy king makes his entry riding on a colt," —

is evidently from a Christian, perhaps from the author of what immediately precedes it, though its position after the crucifixion is an objection to this view.

In lines 440 – 480 of Book **8**, the Son, or Logos, to whom the Deity originally proposed the work of creation, is identified with the child born of Mary. These lines have the peculiarity of being a narration instead of a prediction.

In the same book, line 484 is by a Christian, and perhaps the three lines which follow it.

A disconnected fragment, Book **3**, lines 93 – 96, is evidently of Christian origin.

There are three consecutive paragraphs in Book **7**, lines 66 – 95, written

might unduly distract the reader's attention, I proceed to the acrostic, Book **8**, lines 217 – 243. The initial letters of the Greek verses constitute the words "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour." These lines are on the subject of the future judgment, the phraseology being more or less borrowed from earlier productions. It does not now stand in connection with any portion of the Erythræan verses. Neither can it have done so in the days of Lactantius, whose method of quoting it shows that he took it from some other production. If Lactantius did not find it in the Erythræan verses, there is no reason for supposing that the author of the Cohortatio (see pp. 426, 427, 428, 441) had it in mind, or that it existed in his time.

After the above acrostic we have the commencement, at least, of another in quite a different tone and apparently by a different hand. The acrostic, if finished, would have been "The Cross which Moses typified."[115] Either, however, the author's perseverance gave out, or the acrostic has been mutilated by time.

I surmise that this fragment and the prediction which immediately follows it (lines 256 – 323), concerning our Saviour's life on earth, proceeded from the same hand. I surmise also that they were appended by their author himself to the preceding acrostic concerning the judgment. This, as regards the smaller fragment, would seem to be implied in the allusion of line 249 to acrostics. It is as regards lines 256 – 323 corroborated by language of Lactantius, which acquires the semblance of argument only by supposing that

---

by a somewhat imaginative Christian, not from any controversial purpose, but apparently as an expression of his own meditations and devout feelings, which were not untinctured with extravagance. The first is a meditation concerning Jesus. The second and third are meditations, or directions, on the subjects respectively of prayer and benevolence.

[115] ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ 'ΟΝ ΕΤ[ΥΠΙΩΣ]Ε [ΜΩΣΗΣ]. The initial letters of the lines constitute only so much of this as is not included in brackets. The remainder is suggested by a portion of line 257. The conception is based on the statement (Exodus, **17**, 11, 12), that while the hands of Moses were held up, and only while they were held up, the Israelites, led on by Joshua (the name is the same as Jesus in the original) triumphed over the Amalekites. Christian writers of the semi-Jewish school, in the second century, understood that the arms of Moses were distended at right angles to his body, so as to form with it the figure of a cross. See Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 90; *Barnabas*, 12 (**11**, 3 – 5); Tertullian, *Adv. Judæos*, 10; *Adv. Marcion.* **3**, 18.

in his day these verses were connected with obvious acrostics.[116]

If we now ask whether the circumstances of Christians in the third century presented some peculiarity which offered a temptation for forgery of Sibylline verses, the answer is as follows: In the preceding century the Old Testament had been regarded as an inexhaustible fountain of predictions concerning events in Christ's life. But for some reason or other a suspicion found place among heathens in the third century, that it had been tampered with, or that some of its books had been forged by Christians. This is doubtless the chief reason why Arnobius forbears any argument from it, and why Lactantius defers such argument until other proofs should have given his readers a reasonable degree of confidence in Christianity.[117] The most apparent grounds for the rise at that date of this suspicion are the following: Porphyry, a heathen, had composed a work in support of the position that the Book of Daniel was written later than the events which it predicts.[118] Secondly, a forgery in the name of Isaiah, by some Christian at the close of the second century, was in circulation bearing the title, "ASCENSION OF ISAIAH." Thirdly, two or three interpolations by Christians had found place in the Old Testament, which can be examined in *Underworld Mission*, pp. 39, 75; 3d edit. pp. 37, 38, 71, 72. At a time when scanty

[116] **Lactantius**, after his two quotations from Book **8**, 273–278, in connection with other passages, says: "Some, confuted by these testimonies, are wont to take refuge in the statement that those are not Sibylline verses, "but forged and composed by ourselves. No one will think this who shall have read Cicero and Varro and other ancients, — authors dead before Christ's corporal birth, — who mention [both] the Erythræan Sibyl and those others from whose books we adduce those [argumentative] specimens." — *Institutes*, **4**, 15. The argument, imperfectly stated by Lactantius, was perhaps meant to be as follows: Cicero and Varro mention acrostics. The foregoing quotations are from the only document which contains acrostics. It must have been in their hands, and must, therefore, have existed before there were any Christians who could forge it, and prior also to the events which it predicts. That those ancients could make nothing out of it is, he afterwards adds, no argument against it. The prevalent distrust of acrostics will account for the lack of explicitness in his statement. He wished to avoid, so far as possible, incurring public mistrust.

[117] See **Lactant.** *Div. Inst.* **4**, 5, quoted in Ch. XI. note 40. In an earlier part of his work (*Div. Inst.* **1**, 4, 5), Lactantius gives as a reason for there omitting testimony from the prophets, that heathens regard their teachings as not divine but human, an objection which, but for the suspicion already mentioned, would have had equal force in the second century.

[118] See quotation from Jerome in Ch. XI. note 38.

facilities existed for critical research these circumstances may account for the suspicion in question.

§ v. *Additional Remarks.*

Some remarks omitted in the preceding sections, because they belonged to no one head more than to another, are here submitted.

1. Touching the somewhat perplexed nomenclature of the Sibylline verses, the following considerations may assist the reader. The aristocratic forgery had been attributed to Sibylla of Cumæ; it was, therefore, natural that she should be called Cumæan. The next forgery in her name had been brought from Erythræ, which prompted the term "Erythræan." The assumed authoress professed to have come from Babylon, which originated the term "Babylonian." Babylon was deemed the chief city of Chaldæa (Pliny, **6**, 30, 4), hence the name Chaldæan. Chaldæa and Persia were sometimes confounded, giving rise to the term "Persian"; and, as the verses were evidently Jewish, the term "Jewish Sibyl" was added to the list.

Further, the Erythræan verses predicted Troy's destruction. This occasioned the two terms "Trojan Sibyl" and, as Troy was on the Hellespont, "Hellespontine Sibyl." But "both the Greek and Roman poets used the names of Trojan and Phrygian as synonymes" (**Smith**, *Dict. of Geog.* **2**, p. 621), and this gave rise to the name Phrygian Sibyl. The writer was professedly a daughter-in-law of Noah, his companion in the ark, and the verses gave a prominent place to the deluge. This occasioned the term "Noachic Sibyl."

Further, the heathens in Italy and Greece had no desire that their favorite god of inspiration, Apollo, should be overshadowed by Jewish verses. Hence, in spite of all evidence, some of them treated Sibylla as a priestess of Apollo, and the term "Delphic Sibyl" was added to the list. The names *Herophile*, dear to Juno, and *Athenais*, belonging to Minerva, were also, no doubt, prompted by a desire among heathens to claim for Juno or Minerva the honor of that inspiration which had predicted Troy's destruction.

Such appellations for Sibylla as *Deiphobe*, Fearer of God, and *Demophile*, Friend of the [Common] People, were merely Jewish, or Christian, designations for the character of her teachings.

Further, sundry localities were eager enough to claim the honor of Sibylla having once resided among them, and the uncritical or partisan Varro was overwilling to recognize their claims, though he himself alleges that NOT A DOCUMENT COULD BE FOUND admitting identification with any other place than Erythræ. This tendency to claim a former visit from Sibylla may have been fostered by lines, probably from the Erythræan production, which have already been quoted in note 18.

2. In Varro's time the belief was still nearly universal that the Erythræan and other Sibylline productions all proceeded from one person named Sibylla.[119] In the time of Tiberius, we can safely infer from his letter to the Senate, A. D. 32, that the question was still unsettled, whether but one Sibylla had ever lived.[120] The patrician or anti-Jewish party must have found it for their interest to multiply the number of persons who had borne this name. By so doing they increased the apparent probability that any of the writings, whose authority they wished to impugn, might be from some SECOND-RATE Sibylla.

The advocates of Sibylline authority, whether Jews or Romans, must have found it for their interest to maintain the existence of but one Sibylla; since, if but one existed, HER authority had already been recognized by the Roman Senate in the most public manner.

The aristocracy and their adherents were, in the main, unfriendly to Judaism, and must as a class have decried this Jewish Sibylline literature. Cicero had already (see note 99) suggested its withdrawal from the public,—a kind of suppression which was afterwards zealously undertaken by the aristocracy and Augustus. The party, however, which sided with monotheism, aided by the official dignity of Lepidus, delayed this imperial action during five or six years;[121] and not only quotations, but also the documents which have reached us, show that the suppression could not have been thorough.

---

[119] See, on page 431, note 86.

[120] A proposition was made in A. D. 32, by Caninius Gallus, that an additional book of Sibylla should be received into the authorized collection. The Senate acted on the subject. Tiberius, in a communication with regard to it, speaks of Sibylla's books as having been formerly collected and scrutinized "whether there were but one or several persons of that name."—**Tacitus**, *An.* **6**, 12.

[121] See quoted on pp. 165, 166, Dio Cass. **54**, 17; Sueton. *August.* 31; Tacitus, *An.* **6**, 12.

3. The supposition advanced by some writers that these Sibylline productions originated in different countries at a date some centuries before the Christian era is contradicted by the fact, that the edict for their suppression was addressed merely to Italian localities, the holders of such documents being required within a given day to hand them to the city pretor. It would seem even that the portion of Italy in which they circulated must have been restricted to a moderate distance from Rome, since otherwise a compliance with the edict would hardly have been possible.

4. The verses from Erythræ treated the thoughtfulness of Æneas for his parent and child as εὐσεβὲς ἔργον, a deed of practical monotheism. The common translation of this Greek word into Latin was *pietas*, piety, which, to a monotheist, would have conveyed thoughts of man's relation towards God. Duty to DIVINE power might by many have been regarded as overriding obligation to the Senate. Patricians, therefore, interpreted the term as follows: "It [justice] towards the gods is called religion; towards parents [in new phraseology?], piety; but, in common language, *bonitas*, good disposition." — **Cicero**, *De Partit.* 22; *Opp. Rhetor.* **1**, pp. 600, 601. "What is piety but a thankful disposition towards parents?" — Idem. *Pro Planc.* 33; *Orat.* Vol. **4**, p. 571. Compare citation from Cicero on p. 150, in last paragraph of note 23.

The Lexicon of Facciolati and Forcellini quotes no authorities of earlier date than the Erythræan verses for this definition of piety. Cicero, in whom we first find it, was certainly acquainted with its Jewish sense, which he must intentionally have perverted. He wished (see pp. 6n., 150n.) to represent, that man's highest obligation was TO THE SENATE. Such obligation could hardly have overruled one to a DIVINE power, and, therefore, he assumes, contrary to common usage, that piety was justice, not to the gods, but to parents, and, by inference, that its highest manifestation was to the state. When off his guard, perhaps, he speaks (*De Leg.* **2**, 8) of piety towards the gods; *ad divos . . . pietatem adhibento.* This patrician use of piety or impiety has, in Greek historians of Roman affairs, sometimes found its way back into Greek; thus the complaints of Caligula against his two sisters are designated (Dio Cass. **59**, 22) as ἀσεβῆ, a translation, doubtless, of the Latin word *impia.* Whether such use gained any currency before A. D. 14, may, considering the state-

ment of Dio Cass. **57,** 9, already quoted on p. 7, be doubted. The passage in Plato, *De Repub.* **10,** 13; *Opp.* Vol. **5,** p. 94 C. D., mentions ἀσέβεια and εὐσέβεια towards the gods, but calls murder of a parent or brother ἀνόσιος.

5. After the Jewish rebellion under Hadrian, such Christians as appealed to these oracles must have been more than ever desirous of relieving them from any suspicion of Jewish origin. This was doubtless the reason why, at that period, the idea was first advanced of the Erythræan verses having been written by a daughter of Berosus, the historian of Chaldæa.[122] As the historian lived less than three hundred years before the Christian era, it would seem inexplicable that his daughter could have PREDICTED Troy's destruction. Such difficulties, however, were less observed at a time when chronological tables and biographical dictionaries were unknown. An additional difficulty would seem to be that any such authorship was flatly contradicted by the Erythræan document itself. It is probable, however, that only its doctrinal portions were to any extent copied and circulated by Christians. Of the remainder a portion may have perished before the second century, and still other portions, now extant, may have been then known only to a few.

6. The present confused state of the Sibylline verses is owing to a variety of causes. It would of course be impossible that verses composed by a variety of individuals during three centuries should form a coherent whole. Each author had his special object. The earlier compositions, or at least the Erythræan, contained acrostics. The revision, moreover, of these documents, at the command of Augustus, was guided by political feeling, not by scholarly research or honest purpose. The documents, no doubt, suffered from it. The effort of later forgers to obtain credit for their work by attaching it to some portion of the Erythræan composition, brought into contiguity things which had no connection. Denunciatory prophecies, which failed of fulfilment at their appointed time, were supplemented, or refashioned, so as to adapt them to a later period. Doctrinal and denunciatory fragments were likely sometimes to circulate separately from matters of less interest. This mass, or a part of it, was sorted by some

[122] "She (the OLD Sibyl) is said to have come from Babylon, being a daughter of Berosus, who wrote the history of Chaldæa." — **Cohortatio ad Græcos,** 37.

Byzantine writer. His object was to arrange it by subjects,[123] and although he must have done this but partially, yet his effort could not but increase the previously existing dislocations.

The text of these writings is in many cases imperfect. Sometimes this may be owing to error or oversight on the part of copyists, who were doubly exposed thereto in copying what they could not understand; sometimes it may be the result of efforts to infuse sense where the copyist could discern none.

7. Any verses denunciatory of Rome are probably not earlier than B. C. 63, the date when Pompey conquered Judæa. Any mention of the Tenth Age is not earlier than A. D. 19. In some cases, however, where the Tenth Age is simply an interpolation, the passage in which it now stands may be of earlier date.

8. At the close of the fourth century a Greek copy of the Erythræan verses would seem to have been a rarity among the Latins. Augustine speaks (*De Civitate Dei*, **18**, 23) of having once in his life been shown such a copy by Flaccianus, a learned proconsul, with whom he was talking about Christ. Latin copies, he tells us, were in existence, in rather lame poetry. His remark, that the Erythræan Sibyl wrote certain things obviously concerning Christ, applies probably to these Latin verses.

9. Virgil represents Sibylla (*Æneid*, **3**, 444 – 449) as writing her verses on leaves, which the wind blew into confusion. This idea was not borrowed from the old Roman tradition, which represents her productions as having been brought for sale to the king — apparently by herself — in the form, not of confused leaves, but of books. It may have been suggested

---

[123] The Preface to this unknown writer will be found in the Second Part of Friedlieb's edit. pp. ii – iv. In it he says: "On this account it seemed good to me also, that I should assort into one arrangement and according to SIMILARITY OF SUBJECT (λόγον) what are called Sibylline Oracles, — hitherto found scattered and in such confusion as to repel (for ἔψοντας read ἄπεψοντας) from a perusal and knowledge of them, — so that by admitting more ready comparison on the part of their readers they may furnish to them their intrinsic excellence, making plain to them many necessary and useful things, and effecting a richer and more diversified work."

A first crude effort of my own towards a comprehension of these writings was an attempted arrangement of them by subjects, historical, doctrinal, denunciatory, etc.

partly by the later statement that diligent research at Erythræ had brought a number of her productions together, partly by the confusion which soon manifested itself among compositions of this class.

§ VI. *Patrician Opposition Lines.*

Appended to Le Maire's edition of Horace, Vol. **1**, pp. 559–561, are thirty-seven lines of Greek poetry, which, as stated in a note on page 549 of the same work, are there copied with emendations from Zosimus, **2**, 6. They are evidently intended to be in the same measure as the Sibylline verses. The "Secular Poem," or, to use a translation which will be more suggestive to most readers, the "Centennial Ode" of Horace, which he wrote AT THE REQUEST of Augustus, is based on ideas contained IN THESE LINES, and he ascribes these ideas to Sibylline verses. The verses are in so far predictive, that their directions are addressed as to future generations. These lines were never heard of before Augustus, nor regarded after him. They were composed evidently with direct reference to a combination of events existing about B. C. 18 or 17, and it hardly admits of question, that they were forged in the interest of patricianism. The objects of the fabrication may be classified as follows: —

Patricians, as we can infer from the Centennial Ode of Horace, wished that an age should be regarded as extending to one hundred and ten years. These verses supplied Sibylline authority for such an estimate of an age.

Monotheism caused alarm to Augustus and the aristocracy. These verses directed that centennial rites should be celebrated in honor of heathen deities.[124]

Corruption of manners had been followed by such diminution of number in the births of children as to awaken alarm. The monotheists and popular party urged more correct morals. Patricians avoided this, and, as we may infer from the ode of Horace, ordered petitions to the gods that THEY should remedy the matter. These verses furnished Sibylline authority for such petitions.

---

[124] The ridicule attending this effort to reinstate sacrifices may be inferred from the remark of a senator named Rufus, who "at a supper had expressed the wish that Cæsar might not return safe from the journey which he meditated, and had added, all the bulls and heifers wish the same." — **Seneca**, *De Benefic.* **3**, 27.

One of these lines contains a direction, that in the specified religious rites, zeal should be mingled with LAUGHTER. This agrees at least with the view of religion supported by Augustus, and was opposed to the more reverential and sober views of monotheists.

Horace tells us (Book 2, Ode 15), that already the regal structures of the wealthy were about to leave but few acres for the plough. Tiberius, yet later, is said to have made a similar statement.[125] An efficient agricultural law might have offended the aristocracy. A direction in these lines that a hog and sow should be offered to "The Earth" was very inoffensive to THEM, whatever it might have been towards Jews.[126]

The lines conclude, that, if these rites were punctually observed, all Italian and Latin territory would forever remain subject to Rome.

Several questions of greater or less interest are suggested by a perusal of this fabrication. The promise to Rome of perpetual control is restricted to Italy and the Latins. Did this mean, that the "King from the East" should at least be kept out of Italy? Or was it but a ruse to create the belief that these lines were written when Rome had as yet no possessions outside of that peninsula? Or does it indicate an existing despondency concerning Rome's hold of her foreign conquests. Compare Trajan's medal, page 320 n.

Horace, writing his Centennial Ode in a language which was intelligible to the whole community, omits any mention of hog or sow. Was this the result of accident? Was it due to his own better feelings? Or was it a deference for others in the community who regarded monotheism with favor and would be indignant at intentional insult to the Jews?

---

[125] **Tacitus**, *Annals*, **3**, 54.

[126] Political chicanery may have invented or dictated "The Earth" as an object for propitiation by the sacrifice of swine. If monotheists derided or shunned the sacrifice and afterwards complained of landed monopoly as a reason why Italy did not yield grain for its inhabitants, the retort might be, "You will not propitiate the earth; how can you expect its bounty."

It is noteworthy in this connection, that Virgil in the Æneid (**8**, 43–46, 82–85) chooses a sow as the animal which should point out to his hero a site for his city. A disciple of Judaism would have shunned, rather than selected, a spot so designated. Virgil, who borrowed freely from the Erythræan verses, wished to shake off from his hero the character of a monotheist. Perhaps the same motive prompted him in attributing to Æneas a libertinism copied from the Odyssey.

The Ode of Horace mentions (line 42) the "chaste Æneas," an idea not extant in earlier heathen literature and opposed to the character which Virgil has given of his hero. The only probable source whence Horace can have derived the idea, is the Erythræan composition. The fact that it no longer exists among fragments of that document may be owing to the accidents of time or to the revision under Augustus, who would have had no scruples concerning its erasure.[127] At the date of this revision, some years after the Ode of Horace, the aristocracy in the name of Augustus carried matters politically with a higher hand. In the present case the question would be pertinent and interesting, whether Horace found himself either swayed or compelled to recognize a MORAL SENTIMENT in public opinion.

Another noteworthy expression, "Lenient to a conquered enemy," in the lines of Horace (51, 52), but not in the document on which they were based, was less in accordance with views of the aristocracy than of their opponents.

§ VII. *Quotations by Lactantius.*

The fabrication in the third century of Sibylline Oracles which predicted our Saviour's history was likely enough to increase heathen distrust of any such verses when appealed to by a Christian. The only effectual mode of closing the door against expressions of mistrust was to distinguish between what had and what had not been written before the Christian era. One Sibylline document admitted unquestionable proof of having been written before Christianity, and that was the Erythræan. Lactantius distinguishes with apparent care between his use of this and other documents. For the reader's convenience a table is appended of these quotations and references, an asterisk being subjoined to such as differ materially in language.

---

[127] If Augustus did not succeed in suppressing every allusion to the MONOTHEISM of Æneas, a probable reason is, that great effort would be made to preserve what bore on the MAIN POINT at issue with heathens, namely, the existence of one God. The passage may, however, have been preserved by accident, or replaced from memory.

QUOTATIONS FROM AND REFERENCES TO THE ERYTHRÆAN SIBYL.

Sibyl. Orac. quoted by Lactantius.			Sibyl. Orac. quoted by Lactantius.		
Proem **1**, 5, 6	Inst.	**4**, 6*	Book **3**, 741, 742, 783	Inst.	**7**, 26*
7	"	**1**, 6	762–765	De Ira. c.	22
15, 16	"	" 6	774	Inst.	**4**, 6
2, 1, 2	"	" 8	787–793	"	**7**, 2[illegible]*
3–5	"	" 6	814–817	"	**4**, 15
17–19	De Ira.	c. 22			
46–48	Inst.	**2**, 13			
Book **3**, 228, 229	"	" 17	110, 155 referred to	Inst.	**1**, 14
619–623	"	**7**, 24	420 sqq.	"	" 6
618 (? 722 (?	"	" 19*	808–813	"	" 6

QUOTED AS A SIBYL, ONE OF THE SIBYLS, THE SAME SIBYL, ANOTHER SIBYL.

Sibyl. Orac. quoted by Lactantius.			Sibyl. Orac. quoted by Lactantius.		
Book **3**, 364	Inst.	**7**, 25	Book **8**, 165	Inst.	**7**, 25
545, 547–549	"	**1**, 15	205–207	"	**4**, 18
652, 653	"	**7**, 18	224	"	**7**, 19
4, 40–43, 45, 46	"	" 23	239	"	" 16
51–53	De Ira.	c. 23	241, 242	"	" 20
158–160	"	" 23*	257	"	**4**, 16
161, 162	"	" 23	260–262	"	**2**, 13
168, 169	"	" 23	272	"	**4**, 15
5, 107–110	Inst.	**7**, 18	273, 274	"	" 15
249	"	**4**, 20	275–278	"	" 15
281–283	"	**7**, 24	287–290	"	" 18
348, 349	"	" 19	292–294	"	" 18
358–360	De Ira.	c. 23*	299, 300	"	" 17
420, 421	Inst.	**7**, 24	303, 304	"	" 18
6, 8	"	**4**, 13	305, 306	"	" 19
13–15	"	" 15	312–314	"	" 19
22–24	"	" 18	326–328	"	**7**, 18
7, 123	"	" 16	329	"	**4**, 6
8, 1–3	De Ira.	c. 23	377	"	**1**, 6
47	Inst.	**1**, 11	402	"	**2**, 11
81–83	"	**7**, 24	413–416	"	**7**, 20

Lactantius makes but two quotations (*Inst.* **7**, 19, 24), one of a line, the other of little more than a line, not extant in our present collection.

§ VIII. *A Query concerning Bacis.*

The names of Sibylla and Bacis are mentioned in juxtaposition [128] by Aristophanes and Plato, and this would seem to have given rise before the Christian era to a composition

[128] Aristophanes, *Eirene*, lines 1117, 1120; Plato, *Theages*, Stallbaum's edit. **8**, p. 392; Bohn's trans. **4**, p. 406.

under the name of Bacis which had SOMETHING in common with those under the name of Sibylla, for the two are mentioned more than once in conjunction.[129] The Christian writers do not quote Bacis in behalf of monotheism. This suggests the supposition that monotheism, even if implied therein, was not the most obvious point, and the one most extensively treated in its teachings. Dio Chrysostom refers to it and to Sibylla for moral teachings.[130] Possibly the object of the work may have been moral rather than theological. There is one extant document among the Sibylline verses, and only one, which affords plausible internal grounds for regarding it as having, in an altered or unaltered shape, constituted a part, at least, of what passed under the name of Bacis.

The lines to which I refer stand at present in the form of a quotation, with an accompaniment, between two — apparently connected — passages of the Sibylline verses. The first of these two passages belongs possibly to the year after the death of Julius Cæsar, since it contains an allusion to a crown in the sky,[131] and is free from that asperity towards heathens

---

[129] Cicero, *De Divinat.* **1**, 18. Compare extract from Dio Chrysostom in next note. The article on Bacis in Smith's Dictionary refers also to Ælian, *V. H.* **12**, 25. Tzetzes ad Lycoph. 1278.

[130] Dio when driven out of Rome wrote an oration concerning his flight, in which he mentions the advice given by him to the Romans. "In proportion, I said, as manliness, integrity, and temperance prevail among you, there will be less gold, silver, and ivory vessels, and of amber, crystal, perfume-wood (?), and ebony, and ornament for women, and variegated work and dyes, and, in short, of all the things which are esteemed and fought for in the city. You will need them less. And when you attain the summit of virtue, you will need none of them, but will occupy smaller and better houses, and will not maintain such a crowd of idle and useless slaves. And — which will seem most paradoxical of all — in proportion as you become truer worshippers and more holy [Dio used these words in a Jewish or Christian sense] there will be less among you of frankincense and perfume and crowns [in honor of the gods], and you will make fewer sacrifices and less expensive ones, and the whole multitude maintained by you will be diminished, and the whole city, like a lightened ship, will emerge [from its present sunken condition], and will be more buoyant and safe. And you will find that SIBYLLA and BACIS teach you these same things; inasmuch as they were a pair of good oracles and soothsayers." **Dio Chrysos.** *Orat.* **13**, 12; Vol. **1**, pp. 434, 435 (228, 229).

[131] Dio Cassius mentions among prodigies in the year B. C. 43 — the year subsequent to Cæsar's death — a fiery CROWN with sharp points surrounding the sun. — Book **45**, 17, Vol. **2**, p. 314. Suetonius states (*Augustus*, 95) that this crown was visible during the entry of Augustus into Rome. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* **2**, 28, makes the same statement, which is also found in Velleius Paterculus, **2**, 59, 6.

which at a later date became more common in these productions. A question might be raised as to whether the conclusion is by the same hand as the beginning; also concerning the intermediate piece, whether so much of it as begins with an infinitive be a quotation, and whether it were placed in its present position by the writer of what precedes it. If so, then this intermediate portion is probably of older date than B. C. 43, and had at that time authority or reputation enough to make it worth quoting. For the reader's convenience I give both the Sibylline passage, or passages, and the apparent quotation. The latter is intermixed with what may have been a commentary, or a distinct piece: —

"And then God will afterwards show a great sign,
For a brilliant star like a brilliant crown shall shine,
Brightly gleaming from the sparkling heavens,
During many days. For then [he] will show a victor's crown
From heaven to the men who wrestle in the conflict.
For then shall be a great contest[132] for triumphal entry
Into the Heavenly City. It shall be world-embracing,
Open to all men, having immortality as its reward.
And then in immortalizing conflicts[133] every people
Shall strive for glorious victory. Since not shamelessly
Can any one there buy a crown with silver,
For God,[134] the Impartial, will mete out to them universal justice,
And will crown the approved, but will give the prize
To "witness-bearers" who wage until death the immortalizing conflict;
(To the chaste who run well the race of purity
He will give its ἀθλον prize, as also to those who do justice;)
To all men, EVEN TO GENTILE FOREIGNERS
(Living righteously and knowing one God,
Who love marriage and abstain from criminal intercourse),
He will give rich gifts [and] hope of eternity also to these.
For EVERY soul of mortals is God's gift;
And it is unlawful to pollute it by all kinds of disgrace.

Not to become rich unjustly, but to obtain a righteous livelihood.
To be contented with your own and abstain from what is another's.
Not to speak falsehoods, but to maintain whatever is true.
Nor yet foolishly recognize idols, but constantly honor
The imperishable God first; after him your parents.

[132] For αἰὼν Alexandre reads ἀγὼν. The former may have been substituted as an improvement of the metre.

[133] The triumphal entry into an ancient city was sometimes granted to victors in the athletic games. The writer depicts moral victories as giving such an entrance into the Heavenly City.

[134] For χριστὸς τούτοις τὰ read θεὸς αὐτοῖς πάντα. The former, an obvious corruption, contradicts lines 38 and 151.

To do constant justice, that you fall not into 'THE UNJUST JUDGMENT.'
Do not unjustly reject the poor; do not judge by external distinctions.
If you condemn unjustly, God will afterwards condemn you.
To avoid false testimony, to proclaim what is just.
To preserve chastity. To maintain love in all circumstances.
To supply just measure and handsome over-measure to all.
Not to jostle what is unevenly balanced, but to hold evenly.
You shall not swear falsely, either without another's knowledge, nor at his request.
God hates the perjurer by whatever he may swear.[135]
Never accept a gift for doing unjustly.
Not to steal seed-grain. Execrable is whoever shall take it
To the last generation, [causing] waste of subsistence.
Not to indulge unnatural lust, not to slander, nor murder.
Give the laborer his hire. Do not oppress the poor.
To have understanding in your tongue. To restrain in your thoughts the hidden word.
Give to orphans, widows, and the needy.
You should neither wish injustice, nor permit it.
Give promptly to the poor. Do not say, 'Come to-morrow.'
Share your crop with the needy-handed toilers.
Let the alms-giver know that he [but] LENDS to God.
Compassion frees from death when the judgment comes.
GOD WISHES NOT SACRIFICE, but compassion in place of it.
Clothe therefore the naked. Share thy loaves with the hungry.
Shelter the homeless, and guide the blind.
Pity the shipwrecked, for navigation is uncertain.
Give thy hand to the fallen. Save the friendless.
Sufferings are common to all; life is a wheel; fortune is fickle.
Having wealth, hold out a hand to the poor.
Of what God has given you offer you also to the needy.
Every soul of mortals is alike. Accident causes inequality.
Never use derisive language to a poor man,
Nor speak harshly [even] to a blameworthy mortal.
Life is proved in death. If a man has acted
Unlawfully or justly, distinction is made at the judgment.
Neither to injure your mind with wine, nor to drink immoderately.
Not to eat blood. To abstain from idol sacrifices.
Gird your sword, not for murder,[136] but for self-protection.
Would that you might not use it, either unlawfully or justly,
For if you kill [though] an enemy, you pollute your own hand.
Avoid proximity to neighboring ground, lest you get over the line.[137]
A boundary is sacred. To overstep it causes trouble.
Righteous possessions are profitable; wicked ones are a distress.

---

[135] "Those who trust in lifeless idols when they swear falsely expect no injury. . . . Not the power of the things sworn by, but the punishment of the sinful shall always follow the transgression of wrong-doers." — **Wisdom of Solomon, 14**, 29–31. See its statements of heathen readiness at perjury confirmed by Juvenal, *Satire* **13**, 75–89, 100–108.

[136] For *φίλον* read *φόνον*, as in Pseudo-Phocylides.

[137] This means: Do not, in the absence of fences, plough too close to your boundary, lest, in some instances, you get beyond it.

Let no one injure growing crops.
LET STRANGERS BE HONORED EQUALLY WITH CITIZENS,
For all shun laborious hospitality because
Strangers to each other. But be there NO STRANGERS AMONG YOU,
For you are all mortals, of one blood.
And a country has no reliable abode for man.
Neither wish nor pray for wealth. But pray for this:
To live on a little acquired honestly.
Love of riches is the mother of every evil.
Desire not gold nor silver; for in these
Will be a two-edged, soul-destroying sword.
Gold and silver are a constant bait to mortals.
Gold, chief of evils, life-ruiner, embroiling all things;
Would that you were not to mortals a coveted evil!
For on your account are strifes, robberies, and murders;
Children hostile to their parents and brethren to their blood-relations.
Neither to contrive plots, nor to arm against a friend.
Neither hide in your heart a thought different from your speech,
Nor change according to locality like a stone-attached polypus.
Be sincere to all; speak from your heart.
Who injures willingly is depraved. Who does so under compulsion —
I pronounce not his fate. Let every one's purpose be right.
Pride not yourself on wisdom, or strength, or wealth.
One, [namely,] God, is wise, mighty also and of many possessions.
Harass not yourself over past misfortunes.
What has happened cannot be recalled.
Be not ready with a blow, but bridle violent anger,
For the frequent striker has committed murder unintentionally.
Let your emotions be moderate; not aspiring nor arrogant.
The dream of superfluity is not good for mortals.
Gluttony leads to lasciviousness.
Great wealth puffs up and swells into insolence.
Excessive desire causes mind-destroying madness.
Excitement is anger: unchecked, it becomes vindictiveness.
Excellent is ambition for what is good; evil [that] for what is bad.
Enterprise in crime destroys; in virtue, confers honor.
Love of virtue claims reverence; of a Cyprian increases shame.
The mild-dispositioned is[138] a happiness to his fellow-citizens.
To eat, drink, and talk in moderation.
Moderation is the best possession. Excess is suffering.
Be neither envious nor mistrustful nor calumnious,
Nor ill-disposed, nor an unlimited deceiver.
To exercise discretion; to abstain from base deeds.
Nor imitate wickedness: but by justice supersede [self] protection.
Persuasion is profitable; but contention engenders contention.
Trust not in a hurry before carefully considering consequences.

This is the contest, these the strifes, these the rewards,
This the gate of life and entrance to immortality,

[138] Literally, "is called." So in the New Testament, "shall be called" (Matt. **5**, 9, 19; **21**, 13) means merely "shall be." The Hebraism is a common one in Jewish writings.

Which the Heavenly God has established as the prize
For the most righteous of men. Such as gain the crown
Shall gloriously enter through this [gate]." [139]

The two documents in fine print are current at the present time under the name of Phocylides. The only period at which it is probable that a heathen authorship would be invented for documents already in circulation is in the second century during or after the Jewish rebellion against Hadrian.[140] As the two are attributed to Phocylides in an intermingled state, it is probable that their intermixture took place before his name was prefixed to them, that is, not later than the early part of the second century.

In conclusion I offer as a probable conjecture, that the document called Bacis contained a predominance of moral over theological teaching, and as a plausible surmise, that those lines of the foregoing which speak in the imperative may have belonged to it.

§ IX. *Hystaspes.*

In the second century we find the name of Hystaspes connected with that of Sibylla. The subjoined quotations[141] render probable that the former document was of Stoic origin interpolated by a Christian. Justin Martyr cites from it nothing about Christ; and the remarks of Lactantius indicate that the manuscripts known to him, or, certainly, the majority of them, contained no such passage. The name Hystaspes, if not affixed to it by the author, may have been added after the Jewish war under Hadrian, as a means of parrying suspicion of Judaism in its teaching.

---

[139] **Sibyl. Orac. 2**, 34–153. In line 61 for μηδ' read μή.

[140] See other instances cited on pp. 337–342.

[141] "Sibylla and Hystaspes said that there will be a destruction of corruptible things by fire." — **Justin Mart.** *Apol.* **1**, 20.

"Take the Grecian books. Recognize Sibylla as holding forth one God and future events. And taking Hystaspes, read and you will find much more clearly and plainly described, the Son of God; and that many kings will array their forces against Christ, hating him and those who bear his name and such as are faithful to him; [hating both] the expectation of him and his coming." — **Clem. Alex.** *Strom.* **6**, (5) 43. This quotation is made by Clement at second-hand. He had not, perhaps, seen what passed under the name of Hystaspes.

"Hystaspes also, who was a most ancient king of the Medes, from whom also the river, now called Hydaspes, is named, . . . foretold long before the foundation of Troy, that the Roman Empire and name would be obliterated from the earth." — **Lactantius,** *Inst.* **7**, 15. "Hystaspes

NOTE B.

MEANING OF CERTAIN WORDS.

§ 1. *Words used by Jews and Christians.*

The Jews and Christians used certain words in a sense different from their acceptation among heathens. Lexicographers have confined their explanations wholly, or chiefly, to the heathen acceptation, and even as regards it are not free from error. Further, some terms used by heathens to designate Jews, Christians, and monotheists have not received due attention. As a partial remedy for these omissions the following remarks are submitted: —

1. θεοσέβεια among Jews and Christians meant simply monotheism, the recognition of one God.[1] The **Cohortatio**

---

also, whom I have named above, after describing the iniquity of this last age, says that the pious and faithful, separated from the wicked, would lift their hands to heaven and implore the fidelity of Jove; that Jove would look on the earth and listen to the appeals of men and destroy the wicked. All which things are true, except that he attributes to Jove what God will do. The statement, moreover, has been destroyed, — not without fraud on the part of the demons, — that the Son of God should then be sent by the Father, who by destroying the wicked should free the good." — **Lact.** *Inst.* **7**, 18.

[1] **Justin Martyr.** "Out of all nations . . . persons have been converted from profitless idols and from demons (i. e. heathen deities) to monotheism." — *Dial.* 91. "Us Christians who, . . . acknowledging monotheism, have taken refuge in the God of Jacob and the God of Israel." — *Dial.* 110.

Clem. Alex. "Demon-service (i. e. bondage to the heathen deities) destroys; monotheism saves." — *Protrept.* 90. "Ye have grown old towards (or outgrown) demon-service; you come as if young to monotheism." — *Protrept.* 108. "The bitter slavery of the tyrannizing demons, . . . the gentle and man-loving yoke of monotheism." — *Protrept.* 3. "Alas for your ἀθεότητος, non-recognition of God. You have made the heaven a [performer's] tent. The divine nature has become to you a drama, and that which is sacred you have rendered farcical by [concealing it under] masks of demons, burlesquing the ἀληθῆ θεοσέβειαν, true *recognition-of-God* [that is, *monotheism*] by demon servitude." — *Protrept.* 58. "The Lord, in his love of man, summons all men to a recognition of the truth. . . . What then is this recognition? [I answer] *monotheism.*" — *Protrept.* 85. "The Logos . . . has said, 'I am your instructor.' And this instruction is *monotheism*, being the learning of God's service, and education into a recognition of the truth; a correct

ad Græcos does what I have not noticed in other Christian writers. In addressing heathens it uses by courtesy the term θεοσέβεια in their sense as a designation for their belief. This use of it requires the translation "God-worship" or "religion" in order to retain in English the same expression for polytheism and monotheism; though the idea of visible worship does not belong, I think, to the original. It expresses, as applied to the Supreme Being, merely recognition of, or belief in, him. The writer referred to says (c. 1): "Since a discussion is before us concerning the true [or truly called] God worship . . . it seems to me well to inquire first concerning the teachers of our and your [so called] God worship." With the exception in some passages of this courtesy towards the heathens, he uses the word in the same sense as his fellow-Christians, or the Jews. The instances of his use are appended below,[2] including some which Otto has overlooked in his index.

---

guidance, leading up to heaven." — *Pædag.* **1,** 53. "If he be brought before tribunals and dragged into extreme dangers and risk every possession, he will not give up his *monotheism*." — *Strom.* **4,** 69.

> "*Monotheism* confers length of life,
> And fear of the Lord confers days."
> *Strom.* **2,** 53.

"The sacrifice acceptable to God is an unregretted renunciation of the body and its desires. This indeed is ἀληθὴς, true *monotheism*." — *Strom.* **5,** 68. "Therefore, we need more care and forethought in the inquiry as to how we shall live perfectly, and as to what *monotheism* really is." — *Strom.* **7,** 91.

Josephus. "By what lawgiver we (the Jews) were instructed in monotheism and the practice of virtue." — *Antiq.* Introduct. 2.

Origen. "We do not cease from believing in God, wishing to convert those who are blinded touching monotheism." — *Cont. Cels.* **2,** 79. "Certain evil demons . . . wishing to lead men away from the true God, [do a variety of things enumerated by Origen] that men . . . may not by inquiry attain pure (purifying?) monotheism." — *Cont. Cels.* **4,** 92.

Eusebius. "He (Justin Martyr) narrates his conversion from the Grecian philosophy to monotheism." — *Ecc. Hist.* **4,** 8. See also Paul to Timothy quoted in Ch. II. note 22.

To facilitate investigation the following references are appended: Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* 58, 70, 77, 85, 86, 89, 91, 100. *Pædag.* **1,** 1. In Potter's edition these references will be found at the following pages and lines: 52, 17; 60, 24; 65, 39; 71, 9 and 25; 74, 6 and 14; 80, 10; 97, 4. Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **6,** 3, 13, 39; **7,** 46 (twice); **8,** 59, 75. Found in Vol. **1,** on pages 631 A, 639 F, 661 E, 728 A, E, 786 D, 798 E. Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* **7,** 32, Heinichen's edit. Vol. **2,** p. 413.

[2] Cohortatio ad Græcos, 1 (twice), 2, 3, 4, 5 (twice), 8, 9, 10 (twice), 11 (twice), 13, 14, 35 (thrice), 36 (twice), 37, 38 (thrice). In Otto's edition these will be found pp. 14 C, A (twice), B; 20 B; 24 C, D, E; 32 E; 34 D; 38 A, D; 40 E; 42 C; 48 D, B; 98 D, E, B; 102 C, D, E; 106 B; 108 C; 110 B.

The antagonism between Jews and Christians led the latter eventually to distinguish Christian from Jewish monotheism. There is no evidence that this took place before the rebellion of the former under Hadrian. The author of the **Epistle to Diognetus** opens as follows (c. 1): "Since I notice, most excellent Diognetus, that you are very zealous to learn the monotheism of the Christians." Elsewhere he states (c. 3): "For as regards the offerings which the Greeks make to the senseless and dumb [idols], thereby showing their idiocy, when these [the Jews] offer the very same to God as if needful to him, they should properly regard it as folly and not monotheism." And again, c. 4: "Who would regard (their previously mentioned doings) as a specimen of monotheism and not of imbecility. . . . Do not expect to learn from man the secret (or mystery) of their (the Christians') monotheism." c. 6: "The Christians are known, . . . but their monotheism is invisible."

Origen uses the expressions: Monotheism according to Jesus; according to Christianity; according to us; monotheism in Christ; through Jesus Christ; of the Christians. As they mean essentially the same thing, the references are put into one group. — Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **1**, 27 (twice); **3**, 8, 78, 81; **4**, 32; **5**, 33, 48; **6**, 40; *Comment. on John*, **13**, 9.[3] **Eusebius** (*Ecc. Hist.* **8**, 13) mentions a Peter at Alexandria as the first teacher there of "monotheism in Christ," or of Christian monotheism. Compare cognate expressions under Nos. 2 and 4.

2. θεοσεβής means a monotheist; a believer in, or acknowledger of, one Supreme Being. It designates most frequently a monotheist of Gentile origin, and appears to be identical in signification with the participle σεβόμενος, mentioned in No. 11 of this note.

In the **Acts of Pilate**, c. 2, on page 520 of **Thilo's** *Codex Apoc. Novi Testamenti*, **Pilate** is represented as saying to the Jews: "You know that my wife is a monotheist, and inclines to Judaize with you." A peculiar use of the word in the same document is explained below.[4]

---

[3] These references will be found in Delarue's Origen, **1**, pp. 346 A, B, 452 D, 498 F, 500 D, 525 D, 602 C, 615 B, 662 B; **4**, 219 B.

[4] The Christians in their controversies with Jews and heathens were debarred from appealing to their four Gospels by the fact that these were professedly written by Christians. For controversial purposes some one forged the Acts of Pilate. The extant manuscripts of it imply that it

"To us, therefore, see that you pronounce only the Christian monotheist as wealthy, wise, and well-born." [5]

"Looking to the judgment which is proclaimed by all; not merely by monotheists but by outsiders." [6]

"What never happened before, the race of monotheists is now persecuted." [7]

Josephus states, as a reason for a concession by Nero to the Jews, that "he did it as a favor to his wife Poppæa, . . . for she was a monotheist." [8] Compare John 9, 31, quoted in Ch. II. note 11.

---

was frequently altered and realtered according to the controversial wants of different localities and times. Certain witnesses, who testify before Pilate, are in some copies merely called men, or men and women, whilst in other copies they are expressly called Jews, and in still other copies monotheists, meaning, doubtless, of Gentile origin. Some Jews probably would only listen to Jewish testimony; and some Gentiles, it is equally probable, would, especially during or after the rebellion under Hadrian, have turned a deaf ear to Jewish witnesses. Transcribers, perplexed by the twofold readings, have sometimes copied both, so that the witnesses are styled THE monotheists, THE Jews, or the article is dropped, so as to make it read, the monotheist Jews, an expression which I do not remember to have elsewhere met.

Thus on page 564 of Thilo's *Codex Apocryphus*, in line 3 of the note, "Certain other of the Jews," is quoted from the manuscripts marked "*Mon. A*," whilst the "*Cod. Venet.*," quoted in line 16, reads, "Others again, monotheists"; and from "Paris D" in line 8 is quoted "Other men," and in the text, page 562, line 6, the corresponding passage reads, "Certain other men and women."

On page 536 of Thilo, in line 13 of the note, twelve witnesses call themselves "Jews." In line 15 two manuscripts, the Cod. Venet. and Paris D, are quoted for the reading "Jews," but the latter of these is incorrectly cited. It reads "monotheists." In lines 11 and 12 the witnesses are called "THE monotheists, THE Jews." On page 568, line 5 from foot of note, these twelve are called "monotheist Jews," and, in the last two lines of page 535, the anomaly of the foregoing expression is but slightly mitigated by an enlargement, "the twelve Jews who were present, monotheist men." On pages 530, 532, in the text, Annas and Caiaphas allege these twelve to be proselytes, whilst the twelve allege that they are born Jews. According to a note on p. 532, the text is taken from "*Mon. B*," since in the manuscript on which Thilo's text is based an omission exists, leaving only the words "[from being] Greek children they have become Jews."

[5] **Clem. Alex.** *Protrept.* 122.

[6] **Cohortatio ad Græcos**, 14; Justin. *Opp.* **1**, p. 48. By "outsiders" the Cohortatio does not mean Stoics, since heathens would hardly have deemed them outside of monotheism. It means heathens whose names had been affixed (see pp. 337–342) to Jewish documents.

[7] **Eusebius**, *Ecc. History*, **4**, 26, Heinichen's edit. Vol. **1**, p. 400.

[8] *Antiq.* **20**, 8, 11.

If the heathen use of this term should need to be translated by one and the same expression as the Jewish or Christian use, perhaps the phrase "God-worshipper" would present as few objections as any. Thus the author of the **Cohortatio ad Græcos**, in addressing heathens, says: "According to your own account, when some one asked your oracle, 'What men were God-worshippers,' you say that the oracle spoke thus:—

> 'Only Chaldæans and Hebrews have obtained wisdom,
> Venerating in purity God, the self-born king.'

Therefore . . . knowing that Moses came from the race of Chaldæans and Hebrews, . . . do not think it paradoxical that God should determine to honor . . . the man who, being from a race of God-worshippers (i. e. monotheists), had lived worthily of the God-worship (monotheism) of his ancestors."[9] Yet a less literal translation can be made more accurate. The question may be translated, "What men recognize God?" and in the comment, the man who "lived worthy the recognition of God by his ancestors."

When the word is used as an adjective, it retains the same sense. In the **Martyrdom of Ignatius**, c. 2, Trajan is represented as thinking that the only thing not yet subjected to him was "the Monotheistic Association of Christians."[10] Even in cases which for some special reason demand a different translation, the sense is the same; as, for instance, in the **Martyrdom of Polycarp**, c. 3, where the multitude is spoken of as "wondering at the bravery of the God-beloved and God-recognizing race of Christians."[11] The analogy of the two expressions would be lost, though the meaning would in other respects be preserved, by translating "monotheistic race."

3. Θεοσεβεῖν, to recognize the One God, to monotheize. "As many things as he (Plato) thought proper to utter after having learned them from Moses and the prophets, these he prefers to utter mystically, making plain [however] his own opinion to such as desire to monotheize."[12]

---

[9] C. 11, Justin. *Opp.* **1**, pp. 40, 42.

[10] Hefele's Patrum Apost. *Opp.* p. 246.

[11] Hefele's Patrum Apost. *Opp.* p. 278.

[12] **Cohortatio ad Græcos**, c. 24; Justin. *Opp.* **1**, p. 74 E. The author states in chapter 22, that Plato had learned these things in Egypt, and was exceedingly pleased with "the things said concerning one God," but deemed it unsafe to speak of Moses to the Athenians.

The author of the **Epistle to Diognetus** says: "You will next, I think, especially desire to hear concerning the fact that they (the Christians) do not monotheize after the same fashion as the Jews."[13]

4. Εὐσέβεια, true, practical, genuine, or sincere monotheism; practical, genuine, or sincere recognition of, or belief in, the One God. The term expresses, or implies, moral excellence conjoined to monotheism, more frequently and prominently than it does devoutness.

Clem. of Alex. *Strom.* **2**, 45. "*Practical monotheism* is a course of conduct consonant with and according to [the will of] God." — Compare *Strom.* **5**, 68.

Origen speaks of Jews and Christians as praying to the God who can hear and see all things; "doing all things as if done in his sight, and, since all words are heard by him, abstaining from what would be offensive to him."[14] He then adds, "If such practical monotheism," etc. In this passage he evidently regards these virtues as included in, and expressed by, the term. Elsewhere he speaks of the virtues as being associated with it: "Urging men to SINCERE RECOGNITION of the God of all things, and to the virtues associated therewith."[15] In the former of these two passages, I think that the stress of Origen's remark concerning prayer, is that it should be addressed to the One God. Prayer, however devout, to any other being would not, by Origen or by any other Christian, have been included under the the term εὐσέβεια. Practical monotheism seems its most expressive rendering. Before commenting on the second passage I would call attention to the fact that Origen, instead of using the term without addition as it appears in the New Testament and in the common phraseology of Jews or Christians, adds to it εἰς θεὸν, towards God, or εἰς or περὶ τὸ θεῖον (*Cont. Cels.* **6**, 33; **8**, 20), towards the divine nature. The latter expression occurs also in Josephus. Origen wrote against a heathen, and Josephus expected to be read by heathens. Each, perhaps, made the addition as a means of distinguishing his own from the heathen use. The added words do not add to or alter the signification, but they compel, if a translator wishes to be rigidly literal, some rendering which will permit their addition in English.

A portion of the Jews, and, doubtless, of the Jewish Chris-

[13] C. 3, Hefele's Patrum Apost. *Opp.* p. 304.
[14] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **4**, 26, p. 519.
[15] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **3**, 50, p. 480.

tians, understood not merely moral but also ceremonial observances to be included under practical monotheism. **Josephus** mentions some priests taken prisoners to Rome, who "were not totally unmindful of practical monotheism, but lived on figs and nuts."[16] They wished, doubtless, to avoid the risk of eating what was unclean. This Jewish acceptation of the word may have led **Justin Martyr,** in his discussion with a Jew, to define what he means by it. "Satiated with war, murder, and every wickedness, we [Christians], from every quarter of the earth, have each transformed our swords into ploughs and our javelins into farm implements, and our farming now is practical monotheism [namely], justice, philanthropy, fidelity,—that hope which is from the Father through the crucified One, . . . adhering each to his one married wife."[17] Trypho's views of practical monotheism will be found under No. 6, with which compare Paul's remark in No. 5. In occasional instances it would be difficult to affix a distinct and satisfactory meaning to the word. Some references are appended.[18] Clement (*Protrept.* 22) uses *εὐσεβείᾳ νόθῳ*.

5. *Εὐσεβής*, a practical, genuine, or sincere monotheist; a person who practically recognizes the One God.[19]

Origen speaks of "those who in the midst of such (evils) remain practical monotheists and are not rendered worse."[20] Afterwards he mentions those that "are invited to the feast of the practical monotheist, who hears the Logos teaching as follows: 'Whether you eat or drink or do anything, do all things to the glory of God.'"[21]

Any Jews, or Jewish Christians, who laid stress on ceremonial observances, regarded their performance as requisite to

---

[16] Josephus, *Life*, 3. Compare Josephus, *Against Apion*, **2**, 39, quoted in Ch. IV. note 6.

[17] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 110; *Opp.* **1**, p. 366 A.

[18] Sibylline Oracles, **2**, 315; **7**, 73. Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **2**, 16, 79; **3**, 8, 50; **4**, 26 (four times), 27, 65 (twice), 81; **5**, 28 (twice), 38, 58; **6**, 33; **7**, 3, 44 (four times), 46 (twice), 51; **8**, 20 (three times), 27 (twice), 34, 44, 73, 76. Clement of Alexandria, *Pædag.* **1**, 87; *Strom.* **4**, 107 (twice). Clement of Rome, 1, 2, 15, 32. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* **1**, 3. And in the New Testament, Acts **3**, 12; **1** Tim. **2**, 2; **3**, 16; **4**, 7, 8; **6**, 3, 5, 6, 11; **2** Tim. **3**, 5; Tit. **1**, 1; **2** Pet. **1**, 3, 6, 7; **3**, 11. The terms "good" and "practical monotheist" seem used as synonymes by Sirach, **12**, 4, 7.

[19] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **3**, 5, 8, 9, 25; **4**, 7, 98; **8**, 73. Sibyl. Orac. **2**, 332; **3**, 213; **9**, 149; **10**, 99. Acts **10**, 2, 7; **22**, 12; **2** Pet. **2**, 9.

[20] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **8**, 31.

[21] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **8**, 32.

the character of a practical monotheist. **Paul**, whose use of the word might otherwise have been misunderstood, speaks of Ananias (**Acts 22**, 12) "as a practical monotheist, ACCORDING TO THE LAW."

When the word is used as an adjective, the sense is similar. The act of Æneas, carrying his father and leading his son, is spoken of in the **Sibylline Oracles** (**9**, 149) as a "deed of practical monotheism."

6. Εὐσεβεῖν, to recognize God practically; to monotheize practically, or sincerely: "As many as monotheize practically shall live again on earth." [22] "Let them first learn to monotheize practically as regards their own household." — **1 Tim. 5**, 4. Some Jews and Jewish Christians must have understood it to include ceremonial observances. **Justin Martyr** represents himself as asking his Jewish opponents, "Have you, my friends, any other fault to find with us [Christians] except this, that we do not live according to the Law?" To which **Trypho** is represented by Justin as answering, that he admires the Gospels. "But we are especially puzzled at this, that you who profess 'to monotheize practically' and to excel other men, differ from them in nothing, nor does your life vary from that of the Gentiles, in that you neither keep the fasts nor sabbaths, nor do you circumcise yourselves." [23]

7. Ἀσέβεια, Δυσσέβεια, Ἀνομία. The first of these words designates non-recognition of the One God; the third designates non-observance of the Mosaic Law. The first is appropriately rendered by "heathenism." The last sometimes means heathenism and sometimes monotheism disjoined from observance of the Jewish ceremonial law. Both of them are used, not infrequently, as equivalent to wickedness. **Paul** uses the former word for heathenism. "The anger of God is manifested from heaven against all HEATHENISM and against the unrighteousness of such as hold THE TRUTH unrighteously." [24] Elsewhere he uses the third word in the same sense: "David expresses the blessedness of him whom God accounts righteous without ceremonial observances. 'Blessed are they whose HEATHENISMS (more literally, LAW-lessnesses) are forgiven and their sins covered over.' . . . Was this a blessing upon Jews or also upon heathens?" [25] The second of the above terms

[22] **Sibyl. Orac. 4**, 186.
[23] Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 10; *Opp.* **2**, pp. 36 A, 38 C, D.
[24] **Rom. 1**, 18.
[25] **Rom. 4**, 6–9.

means "spurious monotheism," profession of monotheism disconnected from its practice.

8. Ἀσεβής, δυσσεβής, ἄνομος. The first word designates a person who does not recognize the One God; the last a person who does not recognize the Mosaic law. The first needs usually to be translated "a heathen." The last may mean either a heathen or a monotheist who disregards the Jewish ceremonial law. It also had a special meaning as applied after Caligula's time, to the head or impersonation of heathenism.[26] Both words were sometimes used as synonymes for a wicked person. The last might be translated LAW-less and lawless, accordingly as it is used in a good or bad sense.

Origen uses the first word in speaking of "heathen fables concerning the gods."[27] **Peter** uses the last when telling the Jews: "Affixing him [to the cross] by heathen hands, you made way with him."[28] **Paul** also uses it in the following passage: "To the Gentiles (more literally, to the LAW-less) I became as LAW-less";[29] that is, disregardful of the Jewish ceremonial law. In the following passage both words occur: "The LAW is not operative against a just man, but against LAW-less [men] who are disorderly; heathens who are sinners; unconsecrated [men] who are polluted."[30]

If the first word be used in a heathen sense alternately with its Jewish or Christian signification, perhaps the term "unbelieving," or "unbeliever," accordingly as it is an adjective or noun, would approximate the twofold meaning as nearly as any English term. There is, however, a passage of **Origen,** which seems to demand the rendering "faithless." "Certain evil demons . . . having become faithless to the true Deity, ἀσεβεῖς πρὸς τὸ ἀληθῶς θεῖον, and to the angels in heaven."[31] To this unusual use we shall recur under No. 10. Some references are appended.[32] It is difficult to find one rendering suited to all passages. The second term means "a spurious monotheist."

---

[26] See Ch. VIII. note 155.

[27] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **7**, 54.

[28] **Acts 2**, 23.

[29] **1 Cor. 9**, 21.

[30] **1 Tim. 1**, 9.

[31] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **4**, 92.

[32] Origen, *Exhort. ad Mart.* 2; *Cont. Cels.* **4**, 50, 71, 92; **5**, 29; **6**, 32, 33; **8**, 20; *Epistle to Diognetus*, 4 (p. 306 of Hefele, or 474 of Justin, *Opp.* **2**), with which compare the allegation in c. 3, that the Jews, by sacrificing, put themselves on a par with heathens. See references also in any Greek concordance of the New Testament.

9. Ἀσεβεῖν, to ignore or deny God, to be heathenized, or behave in a heathenish manner. Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **6**, 29; **8**, 72; *Exhort. ad Mart.* 7; Justin. *Apol.* **1**, 27.

10. Σέβειν, προσκυνεῖν. The former of these words means to recognize the One God; also to recognize as a god, to deify. It does not, I think, express any outward or visible worship or manifestation of reverence. The latter word, which means to bow down, expresses visible manifestation of worship towards God, or of respect towards man. It is used to designate the worship at Jerusalem and Gerizim,[33] and also a servant's reverence for his master.[34] The former word is by Jews and Christians restricted exclusively, or nearly so, to the Supreme Being, unless when applied in terms of disapproval to the deification of other beings or objects.[35]

Origen says: "We find them (angels) . . . called gods in the sacred writings, yet not so that there is any command for us to deify, and bow down (instead of to God), to servants who bring us what God appoints."[36] Further on he states: "It is manifest to those who examine Jewish views, — and those of Christians correspond to them, — that the Jews in obedience to the Law . . . deify nothing else save the God over all things."[37] And again: "Whether we discuss with the Jews, or are by ourselves, we know one and the same God, whom the Jews formerly recognized, and now profess to recognize. We never deny him."[38]

Probably the Jews and a portion, if not all, of the Christians deemed the word improperly applied to any but the Supreme Being. In the Martyrdom of Polycarp the writer might seem purposely to avoid its application to Jesus.[39] So

---

[33] John, **4**, 20–22.

[34] Matt. **18**, 26.

[35] **Wisdom of Solomon, 15**, 18: "They deify the vilest animals." **Origen**, *Cont. Cels.* **7**, 54: "If, according to Celsus, it were appropriate in any persons to deify a man because of his virtue, [yet] it would not be reasonable to proclaim Anaxarchus a god."

[36] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **5**, 4; compare **5**, 10.

[37] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **5**, 6.

[38] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **6**, 29.

[39] The heathens advocated burning rather than burying the body of Polycarp, "lest they (the Christians), deserting the crucified one, should begin to deify this man, . . . being ignorant that we cannot desert Christ . . . nor deify another. For to him indeed, [though ?] Son of God, we, [merely ?] προσκυνοῦμεν, DO HOMAGE." — **Martyrdom of Polycarp**, 19, Hefele, pp. 292, 294. The change of terms suggests the question whether the writer shrank from applying the former term to Christ.

might Justin Martyr in the first passage appended below.[40] Whether in the second he did, or did not, intend it to be connected only with the Supreme Being is a fair matter for question. But Origen, notwithstanding his above statements, applies it twice to the Son in connection with the Father, on the ground apparently that Jesus, though not an object of prayer, was the medium through whom Christians addressed God.[41]

---

[40] **Justin**, in *Apol.* **1**, 13, says, we recognize as God "the Maker of the Universe"; after amplifying which, he says, "We honor . . . Jesus Christ . . . and the Holy Spirit." This strengthens the first of the interpretations below. He seems also, in *Apol.* **2**, 13, to avoid the use of σεβεῖν towards Christ. Compare p. 353, note 50.

The clauses in the following translation numbered 1 may have been mentally connected with each other by Justin, and so also the clauses numbered 2: "[1.] Him (the Supreme Being) and [2.] the Son who came from him and taught us these things and the army of good angels who follow and resemble him and the PROPHETIC spirit we [1.] recognize as God and [2.] do homage to." — **Justin Martyr**, *Apol.* **1**, 6. If we suppose that the latter two terms apply to the whole of what precedes, then we must understand Justin as deifying angels and the PROPHETIC spirit. Origen, as we have seen, ignores and denies any deification of angels by Christians, though, as mentioned under No. 8, he treats the demons as ἀσεβεῖς πρὸς...ἀγγέλους.

[41] "For every request and prayer and supplication and expression of thanks is to be sent up to the God of all things through the high-priest, above all angels, the en-souled Logos and God." — **Origen**, *Cont. Cels.* **5**, '. The sequence, if I understand it, tells Celsus that when certain impossibilities shall happen, Christians will pray to Christ. A different interpretation of the concluding part will be found in Norton's *Statement of Reasons*, p. 233. Elsewhere he lays stress on the fact that Jesus "did not say, Ask me, nor simply ask the Father; but, if ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it to you. . . . Why should you pray to me? Prayer should be offered to the Father only, to whom I also pray." — **Origen**, *De Orat.* 15, pp. 222 F, 223 C. Elsewhere, he says: "Wherefore, to the best of our ability, we by supplications and requests deify the One God and his One Son and Logos and Image, offering to the God of all things prayers through his only begotten, to whom we first bring them with the request that he — the propitiation for our sins — should as high-priest present our prayers, sacrifices, and supplications to the God over all things. . . . And, indeed, we deify the Father, admiring his Son, [who is] reason and wisdom and truth and righteousness, and all things which we have learned the Son of God to be, and thus also [by our admiration we deify (?)] him who is born of such a Father." — **Origen**, *Cont. Cels.* **8**, 13. A similar statement occurs in Book **8**, 26, of the same work, namely, that the only begotten Logos should be requested to "present our prayers to his God and our God, to his Father and the Father of all who live according to the Logos of God"; but in this passage the word under consideration is not found. In Book **8**, 70, however, it is probably applied to Christ in connection with God, though the sentence might

For convenience of investigation a list is appended of some passages in which the word occurs. In one of these, indicated by an asterisk, *σέβω* is used, a form not given in Passow's list.[42]

11. Σεβόμενος, φοβούμενος. The former of these terms, either with or without the word "God" after it, designates a monotheist, and appears to have been used almost exclusively as a designation for Gentile monotheists.[43] I am uncertain whether the latter word be identical with it in meaning, or whether by the latter should sometimes be understood a religious monotheist.[44] Newcome translates, save in one instance, with attention to the fact, that the two words referred to Gentiles.

12. Δοῦλος, a born bondsman. The Jews, as is well known to biblical lexicographers, used it to designate their relation towards the Deity. They were his born bondsmen.[45] Possibly, however, born bondsmen, trained in a master's service, may have been, more frequently than other slaves, his trusted domestics and the inmates of his dwelling. If so,

---

bear a different construction. In two passages, moreover (*Cont. Cels.* **7**, 8, and *In Joan.* **2**, 21, p. 79 D), a participle of *ἀσεβεῖν* is applied to Christ.

[42] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **1**, 11, 23, 26; **4**, 26; **5**, 4, 6, 27, 28, 35, 38, 48; **6**, 4, 29; **7**, 42, 51, 62, 64, 67, 69, 70; **8**, 10, 13, 14, 16, 21, 54, 69, 75; Idem, *Exhort. ad Mart.* 46*; Idem, *Comment. on John*, **13**, 17. Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* 117 (10); *Strom.* **1**, (21) 106; **6**, (5) 39, 41. *Epistle to Diognetus*, 2, 3.

[43] "Many of the Jews and monotheist proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas." — **Acts 13**, 43. The Jews stirred up the monotheist "women of rank"; that is, from among the Gentiles. — **Acts 13**, 50. "A certain woman named Lydia, . . . a [Gentile] monotheist.' — **Acts 16**, 14. "Some of them (the Jews) believed . . . and of the Greek monotheists a great multitude." — **Acts 17**, 4. "Therefore he disputed in the synagogue with the Jews and with [Gentile] monotheists." — **Acts 17**, 17. "Justus, a [Gentile] monotheist." — **Acts 18**, 7. A monotheistic proselyte means a proselyte, not to Jewish customs, but to Jewish belief in one God.

[44] "Cornelius . . . a [Gentile] Fearer of God." — **Acts 10**, 1, repeated in verse 2. "In every nation (that is, among all Gentiles) the Fearer of Him who doeth righteously shall be accepted by him." — **Acts 10**, 35. "Men of Israel and ye [Gentile] Fearers of God, listen." — **Acts 13**, 16. "Brother men, sons of the race of Abraham, and those [Gentiles] among you, who are Fearers of God." — **Acts 13**, 26. "Praise God, all ye his Bondsmen [that is, ye Jews], and ye [Gentiles] who are Fearers of him." — **Rev. 19**, 5.

[45] A New Testament concordance will give sufficient references. One instance of the usage will be found in the preceding note.

the Jewish use of this term may have implied, not only that by birth they belonged to Jehovah, but also that they were the inmates of his household.

13. Λαοί, peoples. The use of this word in the singular as a term for the Jews, in contradistinction from "The Nations" or Gentiles, is well enough known. In the plural, I surmise, that it meant the various nationalities of Jews; the Jews of Italy being considered as one people, the Jews of Egypt as another, those of Syria another, and so on.[46]

§ II. *Terms applied by Heathens to Jews or Christians.*

1. Foreign Superstition, or Foreign Rites. The Roman authorities in A. D. 19 passed an enactment against the Jewish and Egyptian religions.[47] From that period, the term "Foreign" superstition, or superstitions, denoted Judaism almost exclusively. **Tacitus,** after mentioning the action against the two religions, speaks without explanation of "THAT superstition,"[48] taking it for granted, apparently, that his readers would understand him to mean — as from Josephus we know that he did mean — Judaism. **Seneca,** referring to the same disturbance, says: "Foreign religious observances, *alienigena sacra,* were then in course of expulsion."[49] Seneca's context implies that he meant Jews. Pomponia was accused of "Foreign superstition."[50] Claudius is reported by Tacitus as attributing the indifference for Roman religious customs to the growth of "Foreign superstitions."[51]

---

[46] "A crowd . . . from every nation and of tribes and peoples and languages." — **Rev. 7,** 9. "You must prophesy again to peoples and nations." — **Rev. 10,** 11. "From peoples . . . and nations." — **Rev. 11,** 9. "The waters . . . represent peoples . . . and nations." — **Rev. 17,** 15. "They will teach all peoples and all nations." — **Ascension of Isaiah, 3,** 18. Cp. Ps. of Sol. **17,** 32, 49; Fabric. pp. 966, 969.

In the Sibylline books the plural use of this word occurs in Book **1,** 128, 149; **2,** 160; **9,** 307. The first two of these instances are from the Erythræan verses and have reference to the earth's inhabitants in the time of Noah. The author of that document wished to convey the idea that idolatry was of later date than Noah. On this supposition the contemporaries of Noah were monotheists, though wicked ones. In maintenance of this idea the author needed to call them peoples rather than nations. In Books **8,** 140, **9,** 305, the word now stands in the plural, but was originally, I suspect, in the singular.

[47] Tacitus, *An.* **2,** 85, quoted in Ch. VIII. note 8.

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] Seneca, *Epist.* **108,** 22.

[50] See Tacitus, *An.* **13,** 32, referred to on pp. 8, 242.

[51] Tacitus, *An.* **11,** 15. The term is here used in the plural, but it is

2. Ἄθεοι, ἀσεβεῖς, atheists, unbelievers. These two words, towards the middle of the second century, were in use among the heathens as terms for the Christians.[52] So far as we may judge from their derivation they would seem equally fitted to designate at an earlier date Gentile monotheists. In determining whether they were so used, the action of the Jews, appended below,[53] implies that before the rebellion of these latter under Hadrian, atheism must have meant Christianity. The remarks of Dio Cassius[54] pertain to a still earlier date, but the application of his phraseology might admit question. I suspect that he uses both terms as synonymes for Christians.

Notwithstanding a remark of Justin Martyr,[55] I have not found the term ἀσεβεῖς, unbelievers, applied to any nation. One such application of the term ἄθεοι has met me. Celsus speaks of the Seres (and perhaps of some other nations) as atheists.[56] I am uncertain whether he means the inhabitants

---

probable that Judaism alone is meant. It is well known that during the anti-slavery discussion in the United States, the pro-slavery party spoke of it constantly as an attack on Southern institutions, when obviously but the one institution of slavery was in question. The Roman conservatives wished probably to conceal the fact that Judaism was (at this date) the only FOREIGN religion which they feared. The remark of Tacitus quoted above shows how uppermost it must have been in their minds.

[52] "We are called atheists, and we confess that we are atheists as regards such gods." — **Justin Martyr**, *Apol.* **1**, 6. "That we are not atheists, . . . what sensible man will not confess." — **Justin Martyr**, *Apol.* **1**, 13. "It is not proper to call a man a philosopher, who testifies concerning us in the public assembly things which he does not understand, as that Christians are atheists and unbelievers." — *Apol.* **2**, 3. "The whole multitude . . . cried out: Destroy the atheists; let Polycarp be hunted up." — **Martyrdom of Polycarp**, 3. "The proconsul . . . tried to persuade (Polycarp) to a denial [of Christianity], saying, 'Be considerate to your age . . . say, destroy the atheists.'" — **Martyrdom of Polycarp**, 9. See Athenagoras, *Legat.* **4**, 10 (bis), 14.

Jews and Christians designated heathens as atheists, or without God (Sibyl. Orac. **8**, 394, 395; Ephes. **2**, 12), though, as used by Paul, it cannot have been a term of reproach.

[53] "Selecting chosen men from Jerusalem, you (Jews) then sent them into the whole earth saying, that an atheist sect [called] Christians had appeared." — **Justin Martyr**, *Dial.* 17; *Opp.* **2**, p. 60. The date to which Justin refers must have been prior to the Jewish rebellion under Hadrian, since Jews were thereafter excluded from Jerusalem. The Jews probably did not use the term as one of reproach, but simply as an established name.

[54] Dio Cass. **67**, 14; **68**, 1, quoted in Ch. X. notes 29, 44.

[55] **Justin** tells the Gentiles "that all men are unbelievers, ἀσεβεῖς, to each other, because of their not deifying the same objects." — *Apol.* **1**, 24.

[56] Origen, *Cont. Cels.* **7**, 62. From the phraseology of Origen in c. 63 the statement of Celsus would seem to have been new to him.

of the country vaguely described in Smith's Dictionary as Serica, or whether he meant the Syrians, who had long previously discarded any belief in the heathen deities.[57] By atheists he meant simply people without visible objects of worship.

3. Γένος, *genus*, race. To some extent the Jews and Gentiles spoke of each other as two distinct races. This use of language had become so well established that the Christians were called a "third race." Whether the term originated with themselves, or with the heathens, admits question. Tertullian repels the term as a heathen insult.[58] Origen quotes it twice (*Cont. Cels.* **7**, 39; **3**, 8) from Celsus, but he and Arnobius (*Adv. Gentes.* **1**, 1) speak of Christians as a nation, and the Martyrdom of Ignatius (c. 2) calls them an association. Justin Martyr uses "race" in its previous signification to discriminate between Jews and Gentiles, or between his brethren of Jewish and Gentile descent,[59] and makes the Jew speak of Christians as "your people."

The Epistle to Diognetus, a gentile, uses it with an alternate,[60] thus suggesting an absence of perfect satisfaction with it. The Martyrdom of Polycarp pertains to an occasion — the public games — when the heathens, according to Tertullian, used the term freely. Its use in that narrative[61] may have been borrowed from them. Melito also wrote to a heathen emperor concerning persecution and may have adopted

---

[57] "See how the Jews and Syrians think concerning the gods." — **Plutarch**, *De Stoic. Repug.* 38; *Opp.* **10**, p. 346.

[58] Tertullian, *Ad Nationes*, **1**, 7, 8; *Scorpiace*, 10.

[59] *Dialog.* 10, 23, 43, 47, 48, 80, 120. Compare, in c. 122, the expression, "*us Gentiles*," and in c. 43 the obviously similar use of "*we*." See, in Dr. Lamson's *Church of the First Three Centuries*, the fourth division of a note on p. 82. Justin uses the term "OUR RACE," which, if he meant by it the Christian community as opposed to Jews, would not have been intelligible unless it were a generally accepted title. The "race" of poets, of painters, of historians, would be a comprehensible expression; but the phrase "our race," if met in Gibbon, or Longfellow, would not, without explanation, in the former suggest historians and in the latter poets. Justin never, in addressing heathens, speaks of "our race" and "your race," nor was the term, as a designation for Christians, ever so established as to permit this phraseology towards either Jews or heathens.

[60] "I see . . . you are desirous to learn . . . why this new race or profession has entered into life now and not formerly." — **Epist. ad Diognet.** 1.

[61] Martyrdom of Polycarp, 3.

his phraseology from that of his opponents.[62] **Clement of Alexandria**, in one instance, addresses his hearers as neither Greeks nor Jews but Christians, who as a third race recognize God, and speaks of them immediately afterwards as having been gathered from Greek instruction and that of the law "into the one race of the saved people."[63] He elsewhere uses the term in a variety of senses which are easily comprehensible.[64]

NOTE C.

DELATORES, — PROSECUTORS ON SHARES.

THE above title represents a class of men whose legal authorization was probably a concession of Augustus to the popular party. Their office and proper appellation have both been misunderstood.[1] The call for these men needs a word of explanation.

The Romans had no officer corresponding to our Prosecuting attorney. If a senator fleeced a province and pocketed, under various pretences, the proceeds, or if any one plundered the treasury at home, there was no one at Rome who, by virtue of his office, must assume the duty of bringing him to justice. If the plundered provincials wished to prosecute,

---

[62] Melito's words are "the race of monotheists." — **Euseb.** *Ecc. Hist.* **4**, 26; *Heinichen*, Vol. **1**, p. 400.

[63] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* **6**, 41, 42. I am uncertain whether in the former of these sections the term may not be a quotation from the "Preaching of Peter." The use of the term in Peter's 1st Epistle, **2**, 9, might easily prompt a similar use in any document attributed to him.

[64] *Pædag.* **1**, 14; **2**, 32 (bis), 96, 120; *Strom.* **1**, 62, 66 (bis), 68 (tris), 71, 72, 89, 116, 150, 151, 155; **3**, 20, 69, 72, 97; **4**, 91, 93; **5**, 124, 134, 142; **6**, 80, 88; **7**, 35, 36, 73, 80, 88; **8**, 18, 19 (bis), 20, 21, 31 (four times).

[1] **Smith's** *Dictionary of Antiquities*, one, certainly, of the most reliable authorities in matters pertaining to Greek and Roman antiquity, appends to the term DELATOR (p. 388, col. 2) the following: "An informer. The *Delatores* under the emperors were a class of men who gained their livelihood by informing against their fellow-citizens. They constantly brought forward false charges to gratify the avarice or jealousy of the different emperors." The **New American Cyclopædia** (**15**, p. 466, col. 1) says: "The secret police of *Delatores*, or spies, was rapidly organized" under Tiberius. Gibbon (Vol. **1**, p. 98, edit. Phila., 1816) identifies the terms "Delatores" and "Informers."

they needed, at much expense, to send men to the capital. If citizens of Rome wished to enforce the laws, they had to assume heavy risk and expense with little chance of success. Either would often find that the judge, the jury, and the criminal were almost identical. The Senate was in many cases judge and jury. A member of it was criminal in the present case. Others were criminals in similar past cases. Others hoped to be criminal by filling their pockets in future. Those who needed no plunder on their own account, had plenty of needy relatives, friends, or dependents who were to be provided for at public expense.[2] To procure justice was almost hopeless.

Under these circumstances a crude substitute was provided for our present prosecuting officers. It was enacted in the time of Augustus that any one who prosecuted a given class of criminals to conviction should have a share, probably one half, of the recovered forfeiture.[3] Not an instance occurs in existing records of a trial under this law during the reign of Augustus. This and subsequent opposition to the law on the part of the aristocracy render probable that Augustus, his advisers, and his — in behalf of conservatism — expurgated Senate, were more anxious to have the law a dead letter than to have it in force, that its enactment was a concession to public opinion. As the Senate under Augustus adopted the plan of secret sessions,[4] thus excluding to the uttermost outside influence and public opinion, a *Delator* could, at that date, as little have accomplished by its verdict the conviction of a senator, as by going into a secret conclave of robbers, he could have obtained sentence against a comrade. In fact,

---

[2] See Cicero's remark to his brother in Ch. VII. conclusion of note 18.

[3] The provision concerning *Delatores* was (Sueton. *Nero*, 10) part of the *Lex Papia*, which statute was enacted in the time of Augustus. Nero reduced the share of a *Delator* (Sueton. *Nero*, 10) to one fourth, so that it must originally have exceeded that amount. Frontinus, in his work on *Roman Aqueducts* (127), quotes a law of the year B. C. 11, which fixed a penalty of ten thousand sesterces for certain interference with or injury to aqueducts, one half of which should be paid to the accuser, *accusatori*, by whose exertions especially the offender should be convicted. In the year A. D. 24, prior to Nero's reduction of a *Delator's* reward, Lepidus advocated giving (**Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 20) the fourth of a condemned person's property to the accuser, *accusatori*, "as the law required." A probable explanation of this seeming discrepance is, that in offences against the provinces the prosecutor's reward may have been one fourth, and in offences against Rome or its citizens one half.

[4] See Ch. V. note 59.

permission seems to have been needed from the prince, as presiding officer of the Senate, before an accusation could be brought before it, at least if against its members.[5] This permission Augustus would have been slow to give.

Under his successor matters were in some respects different. Tiberius was not merely honest, but laboriously faithful in his efforts to promote justice. Provincial questions were heard with open doors, and with opportunity for all sides to be heard. He would not have interposed to screen even a personal friend, had one proved delinquent, nor to prevent the trial of an innocent one if his conduct had called for examination and proof.

Opportunity for prosecution implied not merely that a right-minded man could aid justice, but — as the prosecutor shared the forfeiture — that an unprincipled man could fill his own pocket. Under these circumstances a class of men sprung up who made prosecution a trade. No such trade or vocation exists at present, yet a study of legislative bodies would throw considerable light on the methods whereby these men operated. Some of our States prohibit, by their constitutions, special legislation, and others do not. Among the legislatures of these latter some have the dispensation of valuable corporate privileges. This has given rise to an institution known as the "LOBBY," a self-constituted outside body which by its influence over individual members can delay, prevent, or hurry legislation. Some of its appliances are legitimate; others are corrupt. The *Delatores* had facilities unknown to the LOBBY. The Senate upon which they were, in many cases at least, to operate,[6] consisted largely of indi-

[5] When Vespasian became emperor, and before he reached Rome, the Senate, according to **Tacitus** (*Hist.* **4**, 40), asked his son Domitian for the journals of the preceding princes, that they might know whom each one "had asked the privilege of accusing." It would seem also from the *Annals* of Tacitus (**2**, 28) that in A. D. 16 the permission of Tiberius was necessary to a prosecutor. Tiberius must have granted it, though he refused any personal communication with the prosecutor, and seems neither to have sympathized with nor approved the prosecution.

[6] I am unaware whether Roman law discriminated clearly between cases within the jurisdiction of courts and those reserved for the Senate. Considering the manner in which that law grew up, such accurate discrimination would be very improbable. PROSECUTORS ON SHARES, if unprincipled and unbribed, selected naturally for their victims, not the impoverished, but the wealthy, and had therefore chiefly to deal with the privileged classes, the senators and knights, or with cases affecting the rights or privileges of communities.

viduals who had, directly or indirectly, filled their pockets at public expense. They were legally subject to prosecution, and not a few among them could probably, by threats of an action against themselves, be intimidated into voting the condemnation of another. In the courts also a prosecutor would soon learn whom to approach by fear and whom by favors. The Court of One Hundred must have had not a few members accessible in one or both of these ways.

Public prosecution was not the only means known to the *Delatores* of acquiring wealth. To suppose that they did not understand levying black-mail would be to underrate entirely their ability or unscrupulousness. We have at least one record of their doings in this direction;[7] but, even without this, an ordinary knowledge of human nature justifies the inference that many whom they selected as victims would deem it cheaper to buy them off than to fight them. The extent to which moral principle was ignored by multitudes, whether of native Romans or of adventurers pouring into the city, must have rendered easy the manufacture of fraudulent evidence, so that an able and unscrupulous "PROSECUTOR," with a gang of well-trained followers at his bidding, would have found few individuals competent to cope with him. The less adroit, the less wealthy, and, it may be, also the less unscrupulous, who became PROSECUTORS, found themselves swept out of the way,[8] perhaps by combinations of those whom they had threatened, perhaps by the jealousy of other *Delatores*, who wished the field for themselves.

In a community whose public affairs are managed without proper intelligence, and still more WITHOUT MORAL SENSE, the

---

[7] In the time of Claudius, A. D. 47, a Roman knight, named Samius, paid to the notorious prosecutor Suilius, four hundred thousand sesterces (Tacitus, *An.* **11**, 5). This black-mail, disguised as an advocate's fee, amounted to $15,000 or $16,000, — a sum worth much more then than now. It proved insufficient for the *Delator's* rapacity. He must have attempted to extort more, for **Tacitus** tells us in the passage already referred to, that Samius, "having discerned the double-dealing [of Suilius], fell on his sword in the latter's house." Not a few senators, probably, had been fleeced in the same way, for "The Fathers" demanded, immediately, the revival of an old law, "that no one should receive money or gift for pleading a cause." A well-bribed *Delator* may have naturally been expected to keep off others of his own class, between whom and himself there was not unlikely to be an understanding.

[8] "In proportion as an accuser was *districtior*, more fierce, he became as [it were] *sacro sanctus*, consecrated [against attack]; the *leves*, *ignobiles*, moderate and less known, were punished." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 36.

lot, whether of a citizen or of an official, too often requires him to choose between extremes, either of which he would gladly avoid.[9] Tiberius, who honestly wished the administration of justice, could not escape this lot. Early in his reign he must have realized the objections to having "prosecutors on shares." In A. D. 16, one whom he seems to have appreciated[10] was driven by a *Delator* to suicide. In A. D. 20, as already narrated, his trusted friend Piso was also driven to suicide, though in his case a senatorial combination merely used *Delatores* as its instruments. In A. D. 24, two of his intimate friends were subjected to an accusation,[11] but were both acquitted. In the year 27, Varus, one of his relatives or family connections, was only saved by the Senate deferring his trial.[12] During his reign a *Delator* was punished[13] in the year 32; several principal ones were put to death[14] in 33. Two who had accepted a bribe for dropping a prosecution were interdicted fire and water[15] in the year 34, and another was banished from Rome.[16] Yet in the year 24, after two of his friends had been wrongfully prosecuted, he interposed to prevent a limited abolition of prosecutors' perquisites.[17] He

---

[9] Professor Smyth in his *Lectures on Modern History* (**2**, pp. 165, 166, Am. edit.) proposes to his pupils as a question difficult to solve, the answer which ought to have been returned by the English nation after a dissolution of Parliament in 1710 under Queen Anne. A thoughtful reader will repeatedly in Roman history be puzzled by the question how, in the general absence of any DEVELOPED MORAL SENSE, human rights could be best secured.

[10] After accusation had been brought against Libo, Tiberius invested him with the pretorship, and invited him to his table (Tacitus, *An.* **2**, 28), and, subsequently to his suicide, stated that he would himself have interceded for him to prevent capital punishment. Tacitus, as usual, distorts his narrative by attributing, though without alleged evidence, duplicity to Tiberius.

[11] Tacitus, *An.* **4**, 29.

[12] Tacitus, *An.* **4**, 66.

[13] Tacitus, *An.* **6**, 4.

[14] Tiberius "commanded the most famous of the [professional] prosecutors to be put to death on one [and the same] day." — **Dio Cass. 58**, 21. Senatorial crimes are so frequently attributed by patrician writers to Tiberius, as to create uncertainty whether these prosecutors may not have been acting for the popular party against the Senate, and have been executed by it.

[15] Tacitus, *An.* **6**, 30.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] The circumstances of the above action were as follows: A man named Vibius Serenus had during his proconsulship in farther Spain been guilty of violence and brutality, for which in A. D. 23 he was ban-

must have seen little hope of bringing offenders to justice in the absence of a pecuniary inducement. In A. D. 20, however, he appointed ten individuals and drew by lot from the Senate ten others as a committee (Tac. *An.* **3**, 28) to devise a remedy for evils connected with this system of prosecution. The commission must have been occasioned by the prosecution to death of Piso and others of the popular party in that year, though this origin for it is studiously ignored by Tacitus.

It is possible that the *Delatores* of A. D. 33 and 34, who were put to death, may have been political partisans rather than pecuniary adventurers, for party spirit was then fierce and vindictive. It may be also that the fidelity of Tiberius in watching against and withstanding corrupt influences, whether in the Senate or in the courts,[18] may, to a limited degree, have held in check, during his own reign, the evils naturally arising from prosecution on shares. One of the most noted and unscrupulous of *Delatores* in a subsequent reign, Suilius, was a man whom Tiberius had exiled for accepting a bribe as judge. Yet Tiberius was too observant not to see the temptations connected with this system. He was too just to have advocated it, save as a remedy for something worse.

In judging the spirit of the times, and the character of the tribunals in which these PROSECUTORS ON SHARES figured, attention is arrested by the extent to which they and others are

---

ished to an island (Tacitus, *An.* **4**, 13). In the next year he was accused by his own son of trying to raise a rebellion in Gaul. The accuser charged Cæcilius Cornutus with supplying money. Cornutus killed himself. Serenus, save for the interposition of Tiberius, would have been put to death. Banishment being determined on, a senator suggested two islands. Tiberius mentioned that either was destitute of water, and if they gave the man his life they ought to concede the requisites for its support. The Senate then wished to enact that if any one anticipated condemnation by suicide, accusers should have no perquisite. The motion would have carried, but Tiberius "complained rather severely, and, CONTRARY TO HIS CUSTOM, openly on behalf of 'accusers,' that the laws would be nugatory, and the republic go to destruction; that they should rather [in plain terms] abrogate the laws, than remove their executors." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 30. The Senate had selected an opportune moment for its effort. Indignation was strong against a son who could accuse his father. Tiberius probably regarded the movement as a half-way step towards abrogating any rewards for successful prosecution of wrong-doing.

[18] Tiberius, "not satiated with trials before the Senate, was accustomed to seat himself at other judicial procedures, in a corner of the tribunal, so as not to dispossess the pretor of his seat. In his presence many decisions were established contrary to the intrigues and petitions of the powerful." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **1**, 75.

said by Tacitus to have introduced charges of magical arts.[19] Charges also of *majestatis*, infidelity to the state,[20] were much in vogue, partly perhaps because the allegation was so broad and undefined as to cover whatever the accuser chose to include under it. The efforts of faction to make it include seeming, or real, disrespect to Tiberius were pertinacious, even when opposed by himself.[21]

The term "informer," as a translation of *Delator*, should be dropped. It implies the giving of information, whereas a crime was often as well known before a *Delator* commenced his proceedings as afterwards. His voluntarily assumed office was, to institute action and obtain conviction. This the ordinary translation does not express.

---

[19] See Tacitus, *An.* **2**, 30; **3**, 13 (with which compare **2**, 69); **4**, 22, 52; **12**, 59; **16**, 31. The question is fair whether in some cases the charge (ignored by other writers) be not invented by Tacitus to withdraw attention from the points at issue.

[20] The *Crimen majestatis*, according to Ulpian (*Digest.* 48, tit. 4, s. 1), as quoted in **Smith's** *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 724, col. 2, was any "crime committed against the Roman people or [against] their safety." According to **Cicero**, it was alleged to be anything "derogating from the dignity, greatness, or power of the people, or of those to whom the people has given power." — *De Invent.* **2**, 17 (*al.* 18); *Opp. Rhetor.* **1**, pp. 429, 430.

[21] Tiberius repeatedly (Tacitus, *An.* **2**, 50; **3**, 22, 70) silenced any examination into charges of disrespect towards, or enmity against, himself. Yet desire was so strong in one or both of the contending factions to make capital by charging its opponent with hostility, or disrespect, towards the emperor, that Tiberius must have incurred no little enmity by suppressing such accusations. A Roman knight (**Tac.** *An.* **3**, 70) had used a silver image of Tiberius as if it were ordinary silver. For this he was charged with *majestatis*, infidelity to the state, or "bad citizenship." Tiberius would not permit his trial. Capito, a senator, and in law-matters (see p. 171) a leader of the ultra patrician school, protested openly, though ineffectually, against this alleged infringement of senatorial privileges. To the credit of his era, he seems to have been blamed for his meanness.

NOTE D.

BOOK OF ENOCH.

§ 1. *Its two chief Objects.*

A WORK or collection of works, called the Book of Enoch, has — with additions by other hands — been preserved to us in an Ethiopic version, which Archbishop Laurence translated into English. In order to understand a main object of the author, we must remember that some Jews held — as did the mass of Christians — that the ritual and ceremonial law was not essential to salvation.

The writer of the **Book of Enoch** had among his objects two main ones. He wished to represent the heathen deities — the "evil spirits" whom men worshipped — and their progenitors, the fallen angels, as being the originators of moral evil.[1] He wished that God's alleged purpose touching these beings and the practices which they had introduced should be uttered, not by a Jewish prophet, but BY ONE WHO LIVED BEFORE THE EXISTENCE OF JEWS and when their peculiar institutions were unknown. The Book of Enoch ignores circumcision, the sabbath,[2] and the whole ceremonial law.

If the foregoing statement of the writer's object be correct, it militates against, yet without absolutely precluding the

---

[1] The author's statement of moral evil is so disproportioned as to show the class of controversies which prevailed around him. He says that the giants (whose spirits after death were worshipped) "turned themselves against men, in order to devour them; and began to injure birds, beasts, reptiles, and fishes, to eat their flesh, one after another, and to drink their blood. . . . Moreover, Azazyel taught men to make swords, knives, shields, breastplates, the fabrication of mirrors, and the workmanship of bracelets and ornaments, the use of paint, the beautifying of the eyebrows, the use of stones of every valuable and select kind, and of all sorts of dyes, so that the world became altered. . . . Amazarak taught all the sorcerers and dividers of roots; Armers taught the solution of sorcery; Barakayal taught the observers of the stars; Akibeel taught signs; Tamiel taught astronomy; and Asaradel taught the motion of the moon." — **7**, 13 - **8**, 8.

[2] It is scarcely an exception to the above remark that, in c. **10**, 22, the term "sabbaths" is used as a synonyme for weeks. It is there said of the righteous, "their weeks (sabbaths) shall be completed in peace." The Greek word for sabbath was used sometimes in the sense of week; see Robinson's New Testament Lexicon.

supposition that the original was in Hebrew.[3] The author who ignored what the less liberal Jews held sacred, would have found few readers in that language.[4]

§ II. *The Judgment.*

During the Jewish rebellion under Nero, as well as immediately before and after it, renouncement of the Jewish law was probably carried, by Christian converts, of the looser sort, to the extent of lax morality. At this date, apparently, the Epistle of Jude quotes by name the supposed work of Enoch. The second epistle attributed to Peter draws from it. The first epistle of Peter, perhaps, alludes to it, and the Apocalypse contains language so analogous to some IN ITS LATTER PART as to show that, if not drawn from it, both had some common origin. In placing these parallelisms before the reader, the common version of the Epistles and Apocalypse is retained, because Laurence has couched his translation of Enoch in the same phraseology. A more accurate translation of Jude, verse 15, would, I think, be "to convict all the heathenish among them of all their deeds of heathenism wherewith they ignored God."

Jude.	**Book of Enoch.**
Verses 14, 15. "And indeed Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord is coming with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."	CHAP. 2. "Behold, he comes with ten thousands of his saints to execute judgment upon them, and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal for everything which the sinful and ungodly have done and committed against him."

[3] That the Ethiopic version was made from the Greek appears to be admitted (Luecke, *Einleit. in die Offenbar.* 2d edit. Vol. **1**, p. 109; *New Am. Cyclop.* art. *Enoch*); but Luecke, after discussing on p. 110–113 whether the Greek were a translation from the Hebrew, apparently decides this question (p. 144) in the affirmative. Hoffmann (*Das Buch Henoch*, Vol. **1**, p. 30) assumes without hesitation that the original was in Hebrew. See also Laurence's *Book of Enoch*, p. xxviii, and the *New Am. Cyclopædia*, art. *Enoch*.

[4] After the rebellion under Hadrian, Jewish and anti-Jewish feeling was so bitter that the Jews would not have tolerated among their number those who advocated salvation without "The Law." The Liberalist Jews must have either been absorbed into the Christian body, or if they remained among their brethren, must have been silenced. Under these circumstances the remark of Origen is not surprising: "The books (of Enoch) do not seem to be esteemed an authority among Jews." — **Origen**, *in Num. Hom.* **28**, 2; *Opp.* **2**, p. 384 E, F, edit. Lommatzsch, **10**, p. 366.

§ III. *The Planets.*

The planets were by the heathens named after their deities. If this took place before the Book of Enoch was written, it, or the common astrological use of planets, may explain the indignation wherewith this book views them. They were the only stars which disobeyed God by not coming in their season. Compare on this subject Ch. IV. note 8.

Jude.

12, 13. "These are . . . WANDERING STARS, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever."

Book of Enoch.

18, 14, 16. "I beheld seven stars . . . like spirits entreating me, . . . the stars are those which transgressed the commandment of God; . . . for they CAME NOT IN THEIR PROPER SEASON. . . . Therefore . . . he . . . bound them, until the period of the consummation of their crimes in the secret year." **21**, 3. "These are those of the stars which have transgressed the commandment of the most high God; and are here bound, until the infinite number of the days of their crimes be completed."

§ IV. *Punishment of Angels.*

In the next extracts two things deserve notice. The kind of punishment to which the angels were subjected, as described by Jude, is the same which we find in the Book of Enoch, namely, chains of darkness. Further, the punishment of the angels is connected as closely with the flood and the preservation of Noah in 2 Peter as in Enoch's alleged work. The metaphor, "chains of darkness," is illustrated by a passage in the **Wisdom of Solomon (17**, 2, 16, 17). The Egyptians "being shut up in their houses, the prisoners of darkness, and fettered with the bonds of a long night, lay . . . shut up in a prison without iron bars, . . . they were all bound with one chain of darkness." Such fetters, though potent as iron, were of course weightless; hence the singular expression in the Book of Enoch, **53**, 5.

Jude.

6. "Those angels who kept not their first estate, but forsook their habitation, he keepeth in everlasting CHAINS under DARKNESS for judgment at the great day."

2 Peter.

2, 4, 5. "If God spared not the angels that sinned, but delivered them to be kept till the judgment, punishing (literally Tartarus-ing) them with CHAINS OF DARKNESS, nor spared the old world, but saved with seven others

Book of Enoch.

7, 2. "When the angels, the sons of heaven, beheld them [the daughters of men], they became enamored of them. 7. Their whole number was two hundred, who descended upon Ardis, which is the top of Mount Armon." **10**, 1–9. "The Most High . . . sent Arsyalalyur to the son of Lamech [Noah], saying . . . explain to him the consummation which is about to take place [as a means of removing the mischiefs occasioned by the angels, and their children, the giants];

Noah, a preacher of righteousness,[5] and brought a flood on a world of ungodly men."

for all the earth shall perish; the waters of a deluge shall come over the whole earth, and all things which are in it shall be destroyed. And now teach him how he may escape, and how his seed may remain in all the earth. The Lord said . . . Bind Azazyel hand and foot, cast him into DARKNESS; and opening the desert which is in Dudael, cast him in there . . . covering him with DARKNESS; . . . cover his face, that he may not see the light. . . . In the great day of judgment, let him be cast into the fire." 15. "Bind them [the angels] for seventy generations underneath the earth, even to the day of judgment." **12**, 5-7. "The Lord said to me: Enoch, . . . tell the Watchers of heaven, who have deserted the lofty sky, and their holy, everlasting station, . . . who have been greatly corrupted on the earth, that on the earth they shall never obtain peace and remission of sin." **14**, 2-4. "I [Enoch] have written your petition; . . . what you request will not be granted; . . . never shall you ascend into heaven. He has said that on the earth he will bind you as long as the world endures." **15**, 1. "Say to the Watchers of heaven who have sent thee to pray for them." **16**, 5. "Never, therefore, shall you obtain peace." **21**, 6. "Enoch, . . . this terrific place . . . is the prison of the angels; and here are they kept forever." **53**, 3, 5. "My eyes beheld . . . FETTERS of iron WITHOUT WEIGHT; . . . these are prepared for the host of Azazeel." **54**, 6. "I beheld hosts of angels who were moving in punishment, confined in a network of iron and brass." **66** 4. "They shall confine those angels . . . in that burning valley."

§ v. *Renovation of the Universe by Fire.*

The renovation of the universe by fire was, as we have seen,[6] held by many Jews OUTSIDE OF PALESTINE. The only allusion to it in the New Testament is the following passage of 2 Peter. The prior use, by that epistle, of the work ascribed to Enoch, renders probable that the following also may have been borrowed from or suggested by it.

2 Peter.	Book of Enoch.
3, 7. "The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 10. "The elements	**1**, 6. "The lofty mountains shall be troubled [in the day of God's judgment], and the exalted hills depressed, melting like a honeycomb [like wax?] in the flame. The earth shall be im-

[5] "A preacher of rectitude" would be a more correct translation. Those patriarchs who pleased God prior to Abraham's time, and PERHAPS also from the time of Abraham to that of Moses, were by the early Christians, and apparently by the Jews, designated as δίκαιοι, JUST MEN, in distinction from the Jewish prophets, or from any who added to justice an observance of the Law (see *Underworld Mission*, pp. 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 22, 58; 3d edit. pp. 5, 9, 11, 12, 21, 22, 57). Noah's designation, "preacher (δικαιοσύνης) of justice," or rectitude, is intended to distinguish him from such as, in addition thereto, preached Jewish observances. Jude's mention of Enoch, as the seventh from Adam, was intended, probably, to convey the same idea, that he lived and taught prior to Jewish institutions.

[6] See pp. 44, 45, 56, 140, and compare the last-mentioned page with note 45 on p. 55.

shall melt with fervent heat. The earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." 12. . . . "The heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." 13. "Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

merged, and all things which are in it perish." **92**, 16, 17. "A spacious eternal heaven shall spring forth in the midst of the angels. The former heaven shall depart and pass away; a new heaven shall appear. Afterwards likewise shall there be many weeks, which shall eternally exist in goodness and in righteousness."

§ VI. *Soul and Spirit.*

The ancients discriminated sometimes between soul and spirit, using the former to designate the vital, or rational, principle in human, and the latter for the same principle in superhuman, beings; see Ch. III. note 17. The Book of Enoch makes this distinction.[7] The First Epistle of Peter, by restricting its mention of disobedient spirits to those of Noah's time, renders probable that it refers to those described in that book. Were it certain that 2 Peter is correctly attributed to the apostle, this probability would be increased.

1 Peter.

3, 19, 20. "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which formerly were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water."

Book of Enoch.

15, 8. "Now the giants, who have been born of spirit and of flesh, shall be called upon earth evil spirits, . . . because they were created from above; from the holy Watchers was their beginning and primary foundation. Evil spirits shall they be upon earth, and the spirits of the wicked shall they be called."

§ VII. *Parallelism of the Apocalypse and Book of Enoch.*

Between the Apocalypse and the Book of Enoch there is in many passages a striking resemblance, yet not such as to necessarily imply that one had copied the other. Possibly

---

[7] "Enoch . . . say to the Watchers, . . . you being SPIRITUAL, holy (?) and possessing a life which is eternal, . . . have done as those who are flesh and blood do. These, however, die and perish. Therefore have I given to them wives, . . . that sons might be born of them, but you from the beginning were made SPIRITUAL, possessing [therefore] a life which is eternal, and not subject to death forever. Therefore I made not wives for you." — **Book of Enoch, 15**, 1–7. See also *Underworld Mission*, note on pp. 154, 155 (3d edit. p. 148, note 3), with which compare in same work note on p. 92 (3d edit. p. 88, note 8). It will be noticed that the term "holy," in the foregoing, is not, as now, a designation of character, but of position or endowment. On this meaning see George Campbell, *Prelim. Dissertat.* **6**, Part 4, §§ 9–16, prefixed to his translation of the Four Gospels.

ideas and phraseology, disseminated by the Book of Enoch, may have been adopted, in an altered shape, by the writer of the Apocalypse without his having seen the other work. Or both may have copied from a common source, written or oral.[8] Yet the temporarily increased currency given to the Book of Enoch by events under Nero, would render an acquaintance with that work, by the writer of the Apocalypse, natural enough. The passages in it, to which a resemblance exists in the Apocalypse, are mostly in the latter portion of the work, which did not proceed from the original author.

Apocalypse.	Book of Enoch.
6, 10, 11. "And they (the martyrs) were crying with a loud voice, saying, How long wilt thou delay, Supreme Ruler, holy and true, to judge and avenge our blood on the inhabitants of the earth? . . . and THEY WERE TOLD TO REST CONTENTED YET AWHILE."	**47**, 2. "In that day shall the holy ones . . . petition . . . the Lord of Spirits on account of the blood of the righteous which has been shed . . . that for them he would execute judgment, and that his patience may not endure forever." **104**, 1–3. "Ye righteous, . . . your cries have cried for judgment, and it has appeared to you: for an account of all your suffering shall be required from the princes, and from every one who has assisted your plunderers. WAIT WITH PATIENT HOPE." — [*Two chapters in Enoch are numbered* 104.]
14, 13. "Happy are the dead who die in the Lord henceforth: . . . THEIR WORKS GO WITH THEM."	**103**, 3. "The spirits of you who die in righteousness shall exist and rejoice. . . . THEIR REMEMBRANCE SHALL BE BEFORE THE FACE OF THE MIGHTY ONE. . . ."
14, 20. "And the wine-press was trodden on the outside of the city; and blood came from the wine-press up to the bridles of the horses, for a thousand and six hundred furlongs."	**98**, 3. "The horse shall wade up to his breast, and the chariot shall sink to its axle, in the blood of sinners."
16, 12. "And the sixth angel poured out his phial upon that great river Euphrates; and its water was dried up that the way of the Kings of the East might be prepared."	**54**, 9. "Then shall princes combine together and conspire. The chiefs of the East among the Parthians and Medes shall remove kings."
18, 20. "Rejoice over her, . . . ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her."	**47**, 4. "Then were the hearts of the saints full of joy, because . . . the supplication of the saints [was] heard, and the blood of the righteous appreciated by the Lord of Spirits."

[8] **Daniel** (**7**, 9,) represents the "Ancient of Days" as having hair white as wool. The **Book of Enoch** copies (**46**, 1) this description of the Supreme Being. Another passage of the same work (**105**, 2) represents Noah as born with hair like wool, from which his father infers "he is not human, but resembling the offspring of the angels of heaven." An apparently similar conception in the Apocalypse has been quoted on p. 260. — Conceptions altered from the Old Testament may, especially in a time of excitement, have been circulating in the Jewish community, and were liable to be appropriated by persons who did not even know their origin.

20, 13. "And the sea gave up her dead; and death and the underworld gave up their dead also."

21, 1. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away."

21, 3, 4. "God himself shall . . . be their God. . . . THERE SHALL BE NO MORE DEATH, NEITHER SORROW, NOR CRYING, NEITHER SHALL THERE BE ANY MORE PAIN." 23. "And the city [of the blessed] hath no need of the sun, nor of the moon, to shine therein; for the glory of God enlighteneth it, and the Lamb is its lamp."

22, 18, 19. "Now I declare at the same time to every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God will lay on him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of this book of prophecy, God shall take away his portion from that tree of life and out of that holy city which are written of in this book."

Compare on p. 269, note 42.

50, 1. "In those days shall the earth deliver up from her womb, and hell (i. e. the underworld) deliver up from hers, that which it has received: and destruction shall restore that which it owes."

92, 16. 17. "A spacious eternal heaven shall spring forth in the midst of the angels. The former heaven shall depart and pass away; a new heaven shall appear."

1, 8. "Then shall all belong to God; BE HAPPY AND BLESSED; and the splendor of the Godhead shall illuminate them."

104, 7–9. "Now will I point out a mystery; since many sinners shall pervert and transgress against the word of uprightness . . . When they shall write all my words correctly in their own languages, they shall neither change nor diminish them; but shall write them all correctly: all which from the first I have uttered concerning them."

[*Two chapters in Enoch are numbered* **104**.]

The foregoing table does not by any means exhaust the points of similarity between the Apocalypse and the Book, or Books, of Enoch.

§ VIII. *Additions to Book of Enoch.*

The reader may wish to know something concerning the date, or dates, of the tracts, or "Booklets" *libelli*, as Origen calls them, which pass under Enoch's name. The foregoing citations render obvious that all, or nearly all, the collection existed before the destruction of the temple. If, beyond this, we wish to determine, approximately even, the time of composition, we must distinguish the later tracts from one or more which proceeded, or may have proceeded, from the original author. To a limited extent, at least, this can be done. The doctrine of the original author, that wrong-doing was introduced by the angels, is so pointedly contradicted in a later passage[9] that the two cannot have come from one hand. The

[9] Chapters **94–104** are probably a distinct tract which opens with a lamentation over wickedness, but changes immediately to an outpour-

allegorical restatement, chapters **84–89**, includes what the original author plainly narrated, and must, for more reasons than one, have been by another writer.[10]

The original tract or tracts were probably as early as the Christian era. The absence from them of any prediction concerning Rome's destruction might raise the question whether they were not even of earlier date. But the author lived in a remote locality,[11] where, prior to A. D. 19, religious hostility to Rome may have been comparatively weak. Ch. **54**, 9, of later date, is probably an anticipation of Rome's overthrow by the Parthians.[12]

NOTE E.

ROMAN CHRONOLOGY.

It is known that the second year of each emperor's reign was regarded as beginning with the New Year's day after his accession.[1] There is, however, a difference between Eastern

---

ing of moral indignation, with denunciation of punishment for the wicked and reward for the righteous. In it occurs the statement (**96**, 12, 13), "neither [the mineral of] mountain or hill has been or shall be a servant to woman, NEITHER IN THIS WAY HAS CRIME BEEN SENT DOWN TO US UPON EARTH, but men of their own heads have invented it."

Passages in this tract have some analogy to the epistle of James, but are generally more vehement in tone. In the epistle of James we have moral teaching blended with some indignation at wrong. In the present tract we have indignation at wrong blended with some moral teaching. This tract may have been almost cotemporaneous with the epistle of James and the Apocalypse.

[10] The same writer would hardly restate obscurely what he had already narrated plainly. Moreover, in the original composition, as also in some of the additions to it, punishment of the wicked is treated as enduring (**6**, 5–10, **16**, 5), but in the allegorical part, mentioned above, we are told (**89**, 42) that "the Lord of the sheep rejoiced with great joy because all were good and had COME BACK AGAIN TO HIS DWELLING."

[11] The author treats the longest day and night (**71**, 18, 33, 34) as sixteen hours, which implies that he lived farther north than either the Black or Caspian Sea.

[12] See in Ch. IX. the concluding paragraph of note 26.

[1] In this respect the years of emperors were differently computed from those of "Independence" in the United States, these latter being calculated from July 4th to July 4th.

and Western writers in their enumeration of emperors which deserves, but seems to have escaped, attention. Western authors count Galba, Otho, and Vitellius as belonging to the series. Some, at least, of the Eastern ones omit them, perhaps because in their quarter of the world these three were regarded rather as unsuccessful aspirants than as emperors. Eusebius, in his Chronicon, places Vespasian as the successor of Nero.[2] Samuel Aniensis does the same.[3] A portion of the Sibylline Oracles, **7**, 1 – 47, which, from its mention of Hadrian, must have originated in the second century, distinguishes each emperor by the initial letter of his name, or rather by the number which, in Greek, it represented. To each emperor his number and a slight description are accorded, except to Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, who were probably omitted in the piece as originally written. As the piece now stands a single line is devoted to all three. No number, or initial, is given for any one of them. The line, following the description of Nero, simply says, —

"After him three kings shall be destroyed by each other."[4]

It is probably an interpolation intended to supply an apparent omission. Had it been the work of the original author, there seems no reason why the initials of the three emperors should have been omitted. The Second Book of Esdras which enumerates twelve emperors must also have dropped these three from its count, since its contents imply that it belongs to the time of Hadrian rather than of Domitian.[5] The Apocalypse must not only omit Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, but must commence the series with Augustus.[6] The sixth king is represented as on the throne, while Nero is described with sufficient plainness as the beast which "was, and is not now, and shall reappear."[7]

---

[2] See Chronicon of Eusebius (Mediol. 1818), pp. 375, 376.

[3] See Chronicon of Samuel (Mediol. 1818), p. 33.

[4] **Sibyl. Orac. 5**, 35. Compare **12** (Friedl. **10**), 95 – 98.

[5] See Ch. VI. note 38.

[6] Julius Cæsar was killed fourteen years before Augustus became sole ruler, and was, therefore, naturally dissociated from the SERIES of emperors. It may not have been customary at the East, nor perhaps even at the West, when the Apocalypse was written, to reckon him as belonging to a LINE of emperors. The question also deserves consideration whether traditions of his kindly relations towards the Jews can have indisposed them to class him with those whom they deemed oppressors. Compare pp. 153 – 155.

[7] **Rev. 17**, 8. Compare page 258.

NOTE F.

NERO'S RETURN.

§ 1. *As held by Romans.*

When Nero had passed away, doubts concerning his death lingered for a time in the Roman mind. These would lose strength or prominence, and then, by some exciting cause, have fresh life infused into them. But in one respect the doubts of the Romans must be carefully distinguished from the belief of the Jews and of the Jewish and semi-Jewish Christians. These three bodies held to a SUPERNATURAL preservation or restoration of Nero from death, and the semi-Jewish Christians at least clung to this opinion for centuries. Among the Romans any anticipation of Nero's return seems to have died out within the ordinary lifetime of a man and to have had nothing supernatural connected with it. It was only such a belief as has more than once lingered in the world concerning other persons whose deaths were uncertain,[1] and, though it occasioned some commotion, it would need no mention here save for its connection with Jewish and Jewish Christian opinions. The intensity of both these — more intense perhaps for some years after Nero's death than at any later period — could scarcely fail to re-act on the Roman mind, nor is it otherwise than probable that Roman uncertainty as to Nero's death should, so long as it lasted, tend to confirm Jewish and Christian expectation.

A perusal of the passages in the note[2] will show that during

---

[1] More than half a century after the death or supposed death of Louis XVII. of France, articles were written in an American magazine to prove that he was then living in the backwoods of America. See Putnam's Monthly, 1853, and New Am. Cyclopædia, art. *Eleazar Williams.*

[2] "It had formerly been predicted to Nero by astrologers that a time would come when he should be destitute [of his imperial power]. . . . Yet some promised him, during this destitution, the dominion of the East; a portion specified the dominion of Jerusalem; many promised the restitution of all his former fortune; to which [last-mentioned] hope being naturally inclined, he thought, after the loss and recovery of Britain and Armenia, that he had fulfilled his evil fates." — **Suetonius,** *Nero,* 40.

"[Nero] died in his thirty-second year. . . . There were not wanting

twenty or thirty years more than one pretender to the name of Nero arose, and that even so late as the reign of Titus an

---

persons who for a long time ornamented his grave with spring and summer flowers, and who at times would carry in the Rostrum images of him clothed in robes of office, and at other times would announce edicts from him AS IF ALIVE and about to return, to the serious detriment of his enemies. And even Vologesus, king of the Parthians, on the occasion of his sending ambassadors to the Senate for the sake of instituting a league [with Rome], besought, with much earnestness, that the memory of Nero should be cherished. And finally, when twenty years later [A. D. 88 ?], at the time when I was a young man, some person arose of unknown origin, who boasted that he was Nero, the name found such favor among the Parthians that he was strenuously assisted, and with difficulty given up." — **Sueton.** *Nero*, 57.

"At the same time (A. D. 70) Achaia and Asia were falsely alarmed, as if Nero were coming, the rumors concerning his death not agreeing with each other, and, therefore, many feigning and believing him alive. We shall narrate in the course of this work, *in contextu operis*, the fate and efforts of other [false Neros]. At this time a slave from Pontus, or, as others have said, a freedman from Italy, skilled in playing on the harp and in singing, so that on account of his similarity of countenance he had more confidence in his ability to deceive, formed a companionship with deserters [from the army]. . . . The ship [in which the pretender embarked] was seized, and he, whoever he may have been, was put to death. His body, remarkable for the eyes, hair, and sternness of countenance, was carried first to Asia and thence to Rome." — **Tacitus,** *Hist.* **2,** 8, 9. This man, it should be remarked, does not seem to have called forth any GOVERNMENTAL effort to crush him.

"I attempt a work full of incident, . . . the arms of the Parthians also being almost called into action by the trickery of a false Nero." — **Tacitus,** *Hist.* **1,** 2. This one must not be confounded with the preceding. Tacitus deems him important enough to hold a place among the stated objects of his work. He is no doubt the same as the one last mentioned by Suetonius, and the special mention of him by Tacitus would belong to that portion of his work which is lost.

"A certain false Nero [whose name Dio did not know] was seized at the same time and afterwards punished." — **Dio Cassius,** as abridged by **Xiphilinus, 64,** 9.

Zonaras prefixes to his account of the eruption of Vesuvius, which happened under Titus (A. D. 79), the following narrative: "Then a false Nero appeared, an inhabitant of Asia, [the small province of that name ?] who was called Terentius Maximus, resembling Nero in form and voice, and also in being a player on the harp. He attached to his party some persons from Asia, and proceeding to the Euphrates obtained many more followers. Finally he fled to Artabanus, ruler of the Parthians, who, acting from anger towards Titus, received him and prepared to conduct him to Rome." — **Zonaras** as quoted in **Dio Cass.** Vol. **6,** p. 567, Sturz's edit. This Nero can scarcely be other than the one whom Suetonius places about A. D. 88.

According to Dio Chrysostom, Nero "died solely on account of his insult to the Eunuch, since the latter in his anger made known his designs

angry Parthian king could so far calculate on popular delusion as to espouse the cause of such an impostor. Perhaps the existence of a large Jewish population throughout Asia Minor may justify the surmise, that a stronger popular anticipation of Nero's return would exist there than in many other places.

§ II. *As held by Jews.*

A Sibylline verse concerning Nero has already been quoted on page 243. He had passed away without Jewish and Christian expectations being fulfilled by the destruction of Rome. This, however, appears to have proved no serious obstacle to their belief, and we shall find, as already stated, that they regarded him either as having disappeared and as hereafter to return from Asia, or else as dead and about to rise from the underworld, in order that he might perform his part in the destruction of Rome. The anticipation of Nero's return from Asia must have received support from the feverish disquietude of the Romans. But the expectation that the underworld should disgorge him seems to have been held only by Jews, and by Jewish and semi-Jewish Christians.

Several passages in the Sibylline Oracles give Jewish views of this emperor's return. From these the following quotations are made:

No. 1.

"Poets shall again bewail thrice wretched Greece
When he from Italy shall pierce the Isthmus neck.[3]

---

to those about him, on which account they forsook and compelled him in some way or other to destroy himself; for even yet the manner of his death is uncertain. So far, however, as other matters are concerned, nothing hindered his living all the time which all others wish and most are supposed to live; he [moreover] having died, as it were, not once only, but often among such as were vehemently persuaded that he was alive." — **Dio Chrysostom**, *Orat.* **21**, 5. The meaning of this last appears to be, that frequent rumors of his being alive were followed by frequent arguments for, or proofs of, his death, and that repeated pretenders to his name were repeatedly killed. Perhaps it might be paraphrased that he had to be repeatedly killed before he would stay dead.

[3] During part of the years A. D. 66, 67, Nero was in Greece, where he supposed that his talents as a musician and otherwise would be appreciated. While there he commenced cutting a channel through the isthmus of Corinth. Jewish attention was especially directed to this by the fact that some of the first Jewish prisoners taken by Vespasian were forwarded to Greece as laborers upon it (Josephus, *Wars*, **3**, 10, 10). It would almost seem that the Jews expected him on his supernatural return from Asia to

The mighty king of mighty Rome, the godlike luminary,
The son, as they say, of Jupiter himself and august Juno,
Who with all-musical voice wooing applause[4] for honeyed hymns,
Shall destroy multitudes, including his wretched mother.
He shall flee from Babylon, the fearful and shameless king
Whom all men hate, especially all good ones, —[5]
For he killed many and did violence to the womb.[6]
He sinned against his wife, and was covered with crimes
He shall come to the Medes and to the Persian kings
Whom he chiefly loved and to whom he showed honor,[7]
Lying in wait with these wretches against the hated nation.[8]
He seized the God-begotten temple, and burnt his fellow-citizens,
The 'Peoples,'[9] who went up into it, whom he had justly praised with hymns.

---

finish this channel as a means of shortening his journey to Rome. See another allusion to this idea under No. 8, on p. 128.

[4] "He chose young men of the equestrian order, and above five thousand robust young fellows from the common people, on purpose to learn various kinds of applause, called *bombi*, *imbrices*, and *testæ*, which they were to practise in his favor whenever he performed." . . . "With what extreme anxiety he engaged in these contests, with what keen desire to bear away the prize, and with how much awe of the judges is scarcely to be believed. . . . In these contests he adhered so strictly to the rules that he never durst spit, nor wipe the sweat from his forehead in any other way than with his sleeve. Having, in the performance of a tragedy, dropped his sceptre,[?] and not quickly recovering it, he was in a great fright lest he should be set aside for the miscarriage, and could not regain his assurance until an actor who stood by swore he was certain it had not been observed amid the acclamations and exultations of the people. When the prize was adjudged to him, he always proclaimed it himself; and even entered the lists with the heralds. That no memory or the least monument might remain of any other victor in the sacred Grecian games, he ordered all their statues and pictures to be pulled down, and dragged away with hooks and thrown into the common sewers." — **Suetonius**, *Nero*, 20, 23, 24, Bohn's trans.

[5] An equally probable translation of this line is, "Whom the mass of men hate and also the aristocracy."

[6] Referring apparently to the death of his wife by his kicking her when pregnant.

[7] The writer uses the term Medes and Persians as a traditional appellation among the Jews for the nations eastward from the Euphrates. Nero, just before going to Greece in A. D. 66, had received the Parthian king Tiridates at Rome and had crowned him king of Armenia. The particulars of this coronation are detailed by Dio Cassius, **63**, 2–4. The regard for a counterfeit Nero which was subsequently manifested by the Parthian king (see note 2) was perhaps connected with his desire of having an acknowledged tenure in the kingdom of Armenia.

[8] "The hated nation," that is, the Latins.

[9] "The Peoples" was a term to designate the different nationalities of

When this took place the creation was disturbed,
Kings perished,[10] *and they in whom the government remained*
Overthrew the Great City and 'The Just People.'
But when in the fourth year a great star shall shine,[11]
— Which unaided shall humble the earth, —
Because of honor formerly shown to briny Neptune,[12]
The great star shall descend from heaven into the fearful brine
And shall burn both the deep sea and Babylon itself.
And Italy also, on whose account there perished
Many faithful, consecrated Hebrews, and the True Temple.[13]
Thou shalt suffer evil amidst evil mortals.
Ages long shalt thou be a total desert.

. . . . .

Men shall hate thy locality, for sorcery was thy delight.
Adultery and pollution of boys was within thee.[14]

---

the Jews (see Note B. § 1. No. 13). Here Nero is regarded as having burned some of them who were his fellow-citizens. This would corroborate a surmise elsewhere made (see pp. 252, 253) that the Christians whom Nero burnt were Jewish ones. It is possible that the writer of the above was a Jew of the popular party, and may have regarded them rather in the light of maltreated fellow-Jews than aliens from the faith of their fathers.

[10] Galba, Otho, and Vitellius perished within a year of each other. The government fell into the hands of Vespasian and Titus, under whom Judæa and Jerusalem were conquered. The italicized lines, if correctly translated, must have been written after the capture of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. This makes it difficult to reconcile with the date of any comet. The lines may be a subsequent interpolation, or may admit the following translation, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius being meant by "they": —

> "Kings perished, and they in whom the government remained
> Destroyed themselves against the Great City and the Just Peoples."

Or it may bear the following: —

> "Kings perished, even they in whom the government remained,
> *Destroyed the Great City and the Just People.*"

According to this last, the second line would be an interpolation. The first line, without it, gives a good meaning, but if read in connection with it requires the substitution of "AND" for "EVEN," as a translation of καί.

[11] The Jewish rebellion under Nero began in the spring of A. D. 65. In A. D. 69, four years later, the comet under Vitellius appeared; see Dio Cass. **65**, 8. The next one seems to have been in A. D. 79; see Dio Cass. **66**, 17.

[12] A Corinthian coin (see Sturz's Dio Cassius, Vol. **6**, p. 490, note 82) with Nero on one side and Neptune on the other, renders probable that honors to Neptune may have been connected with the inception of Nero's canal.

[13] The italicized lines are probably interpolated.

[14] More than a century before the Christian era, Cato the elder complains (Pliny, *H. N.* **29**, 7, 1) that the Greeks stigmatized Romans with an

Effeminate, unjust, wicked city, doomed beyond others,
Alas for you, utterly impure city of the Latin Land,
Insane, lover of vipers, thou shalt sit a widow among thy hills,
And the river Tiber shall bewail thee, his[15] paramour.
Of murder-stained heart and God-ignoring mind,
You knew not God's power nor his purposes.
You said 'I am ALONE [i. e. unequalled], no one can plunder me.'
But now God, the Eternal, shall destroy thee and all thine.
Not a sign of thee shall remain in that land.
As formerly, — when the Great God sought out honors for thee, —
Remain, sinner, ALONE, amidst burning fire.
Dwell in the Tartarean sinner-land of Hades."

Sibyl. Orac. 5, 137 – 178.

No. 2.

(*Written about A. D.* 79.)

"The evil tempest of war shall come to the dwellers of Jerusalem,[16]
From Italy, and shall lay waste the great temple of God.
But when trusting in folly [Jews] shall cast away practical monotheism
And commit abominable murder around the Temple,
Then a great king from Italy, like a [falling] star,
Shall flee invisible, unheard of, beyond the Euphrates,
After perpetrating an abominable matricide,
And doing many other things with a wicked hand.
Many shall be slaughtered on the sacred plain of Rome
When he flees beyond his native land.
A Roman general shall come into Syria, who, burning the Temple,
Shall kill with the spear many dwellers of Jerusalem,

---

epithet borrowed from this vice. Paul's only discussion of it is in a letter to the Romans. If Cato by Greeks meant, as seems probable from his mentioning "their physicians," those of Asia and North Egypt, the inference may be fair that such vice was more under the ban of public opinion in those countries than at Rome or perhaps (Xenophon, *Memorabil.* **1**, 2, 29, 30) in Greece. Tatian (*Orat.* 28) affirms and Seneca (*Epist.* **95**, 24) may imply, that its chief seat was at Rome.

[15] If for *σ'ἠν* (corrected by some editors into *ἣν*) we read *τ'ἠν*, the passage will give a meaning. Perhaps, however, the author was an Italian Jew, who inadvertently used *σὸς, σ'ἠ, σὸν*, in the sense of *suus, sua, suum.*

[16] The Greek word is Σόλυμοι, which, according to Passow, was the name of an Asiatic people, on the borders of Lycia. Here, however, it is unquestionably a name, either for the Jews, or else specially for the inhabitants of Jerusalem. It may have been formed from the last three syllables of Ἱερόσολυμα, the Greek word for Jerusalem. The "abominable murder around the Temple" may be that mentioned in Note I., footnote 21.

And shall destroy the great land of the Jews with its broad streets.
Then shall an earthquake destroy Salamis and Paphos
When dark water shall overwhelm the wave-washed Cyprus.
But, when from the cleft earth of the Italian land
Eddying fire shall stream toward the broad heaven,
And shall burn many cities and shall destroy men;
And glowing ashes shall completely fill the whole atmosphere,
And the flakes shall fall from heaven like meal,
Then will be known the vengeance of the heavenly God,
Because they have destroyed the blameless race of practical monotheists.
Then westward the broil of awakening war shall come,
And with it the Roman Fugitive, hoisting a mighty spear,
Passing the Euphrates with many myriads
[Who shall burn thee with fire and turn all things into misery.][17]

. . . . .

Great wealth shall come to Asia, which formerly Rome,
Pillaging, laid away in her wealthy home.
Twice so much shall she give back to Asia.
Then shall there be superfluous wealth through war."

Sibyl. Orac. 4, 115–148.

No. 3.

"There shall be in the last time, at the close of the moon,
A world-raging war, thief-like in deceitfulness [of approach.]
From the ends of the earth shall come a matricidal man,
A fugitive, who even now meditates sharp things in his mind,
Who will lay waste the earth, and conquer all things,
And shall comprehend whatever surpasses comprehension of others.
He shall immediately seize this [city] on whose accusation he was ruined.
He shall destroy many men and great kings,
And shall burn all as did no one before him.
The fallen shall he again from rivalry set up.
In the west great war shall exist among men,
A mountain of blood shall flow to the deep whirling rivers.

. . . . .

Fire shall shower down on mortals from the heavenly plains,
Fire and blood, water, lightning, darkness and night from heaven;
And destruction in war, and mist because of the slaughter.
And shall destroy at the same time kings and great ones.
Then the lamentable destruction of war will thus be ended,
And no longer will any one war with swords or iron,
Nor with missiles, which shall not be lawful again;
But THE WISE PEOPLE which shall be left, shall have peace.
Having been tried of evil, that thereafter it might be joyful."

Sibyl. Orac. 5, 361–385.

---

[17] This line is supplied from Book **13,** line 124, where I suppose it to have been copied out of this connection.

No. 4.

The following is from a Sibylline document, written, if its connection could be trusted, in the time of Commodus. Line 65 mentions three rulers after Hadrian. This would bring us to Commodus. As he, however, was a comparatively young man when murdered, and the prince here mentioned is an old one, the present piece has probably no connection with what precedes it.

"One of them, an old man, shall long hold the sceptre,
A most wretched king, who shall gather the wealth of the world
Into his houses that he may preserve it, so that when there returns
From the bounds of the earth the MATRICIDAL FUGITIVE,
He, distributing these things to all, shall give great wealth to Asia.
And thou shalt mourn, putting off the broad purple stripe of rulers,[18]
And bearing the garments of mourning.
O boasting prince, offspring of Latin Rome,
No longer shall the renown of thy boasting exist,
Unhappy, thou shalt not again stand erect, but lie prostrate,
For the glory of thy Eagle-bearing legions shall fall.
Where then shall be thy power? What land thy ally,
Of those that have been lawlessly enslaved by thy ambition?
For then shall be a conflux of all earth's mortals,
[*When the All-ruler, coming to the judgment-seat, shall judge*
The souls of living and dead, and the whole world.
Parents shall not be dear to children nor children to parents,
Because of impiety and unlooked-for tribulation.[19]]
Thenceforward shalt thou have wailing and depression and captivity."

Sibyl. Orac. 8, 68–86.

No. 5.

In order to understand the next extract the reader should be told that the Sibylline writer from whom it is taken designates the successive Roman emperors according to the initial letters of their names, giving, however, not the initial itself, but the number for which it was used in Greek computation. The letter N, the initial of Nero, was in Greek the numeral for fifty, and Nero is accordingly designated by the number fifty. After describing the preceding emperors he continues: —

"He shall be ruler whose sign is fifty,
A fearful serpent, who shall cause a grievous war,

---

[18] Senators wore a broad purple stripe called the *latus clavus*.

[19] The italicized lines break the connection, and are probably a later addition.

Who shall destroy the outstretched hands of his own race, and disturb all things ;
Contending in the public games, killing 'The People' and daring ten thousand things,
He shall cut through the promontory and defile himself in the lists.
But the reprobate shall disappear. Afterwards he shall return,
Equalling himself with God, but [God] shall refute his pretensions."
Sibyl. Orac. 5, 28–34.

§ III. *As held by Christians.*

The earliest allusion, in a Christian writer, to Nero's return is perhaps a passage in the **Apocalypse (17,** 8) : "The Beast which you saw, was and is not and is about to ascend from the abyss and go (or, 'lead mankind') to destruction. And the inhabitants of the earth whose names are not written since the foundation of the world in the Book of Life will wonder as they look at the Beast, in that he was and is not and will reappear." The term "Beast" here denotes the Roman Emperor, as elsewhere in the same book, the Roman Empire. In the eleventh verse of the same chapter the allusion to Nero occurs in a similar manner. Here the Roman power is the Beast, and its seven heads are explained as denoting either the seven hills on which Rome sits, or seven of her rulers. "And the Beast which was and is not, will be the eighth and is one of the seven, and will go (or, 'lead mankind') to destruction.

In the second, third, and beginning of the fourth centuries the Jewish ideas concerning Nero seem to have found considerable currency among that semi-Jewish class of Christians, who regarded themselves as the orthodox of their day. But they appear also in the **Ascension of Isaiah,**[20] in the following passage : —

"And after its completion Berial shall descend, the mighty angel, the prince of this world, which he has possessed from its creation. He shall descend from the firmament in the

---

[20] I have in another work (**Underworld Mission,** p. 8, compare § 22, 4, 5, and Note E.) used the term "semi-Jewish" as a convenient designation for that class of Christians who shared with most Asiatic Jews a belief in the physical resurrection, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the millennium, and some other views. The Alexandrine Jews and Christians did not share these views. The author of Isaiah's Ascension was far removed from them. Yet his affinity with Judaism, as it must have existed in Egypt, is very marked. This affinity, however, is strongly blended with individual extravagances.

form of a man, an impious monarch, the MURDERER OF HIS MOTHER, in the form of him, the sovereign of the world. The plant which the twelve Apostles of the Beloved have planted, shall he pluck away from them; into his hand shall it be given. The angel Berial, this king, shall come, and with him shall come all the powers of the world, who in everything shall be obedient to his will. At his command the sun shall rise by night, and the moon shall he cause to appear at the sixth hour. Everything which he shall wish to effect in the world shall he bring to pass. He shall address the Beloved and say, 'I am God, and before me there was none, no, not any.' Then shall the whole world believe in him. They shall sacrifice to him, and serve him, saying, 'He is God, and beside him there is no other God.' Many likewise of those who had concurred in the reception of the Beloved, shall turn after him. And the power of his prodigies shall be displayed in every city and country. In every city also shall his image be erected. And he shall have power three years seven months and twenty-seven days. And when many believers and saints shall have seen him, for whom they shall wait, who was crucified, Jesus the Lord Christ, after that I Isaiah have seen him, who was crucified and ascended, then shall a few only of those, who shall believe in him, be left to him in those days, while his servants shall fly from desert to desert, expecting his coming. And after three hundred and thirty-two days the Lord shall come with his angels and holy powers from the seventh heaven, in the splendor of that heaven, and drag Berial and his powers into Gehenna."[21]

Next in order of time after the foregoing writer is **Commodianus,**[22] who lived probably in the earlier half of the third century. He wrote a book called *Instructions*, each chapter of which is a separate acrostic, its subject being denoted by the first letters of the lines. The chapter "CONCERNING THE TIME OF ANTICHRIST" is as follows: —

---

[21] **Ascension of Isaiah, 4,** 2–14.

[22] **Commodianus** wrote evidently before the fall of heathenism, that is, before the time of Constantine. He writes (**1,** 6; **8,** 9; **25,** 10, 14) as if the extravagant use of the Old Testament by Christians had not yet fallen into discredit (see pp. 344–348, and foot-notes 38, 39, 40), and therefore wrote probably before the second half of the third century. In **6,** 2, 3, of his *Instructions*, moreover, he asks the heathens, "Why have you remained [literally, been] children for two hundred years?" Its only natural explanation implies that he wrote about two hundred years after the birth, or else after the ministry, of Christ.

"Isaiah said,[23] *This is the man who shall move the world,*
And likewise Kings, — under whom the earth shall be made a desert.
Hear — since the prophet foretold concerning him,
I have spoken nothing elaborately, but carelessly.
— The world shall come to an end when he shall appear.
He will divide the world among three[24] commanders.
But when Nero shall have been raised from the Underworld,
Elijah will come first to seal the chosen;
During which things Africa and the Arctic nations —
The whole earth — will tremble everywhere for seven years.
Elijah will occupy half and Nero half that period.
Then impure Babylon being reduced to ashes,
The Latin victor shall go thence to Jerusalem,
And shall then say, 'I am Christ to whom you are accustomed to pray.'
And indeed the 'natural' men being deceived will praise him,
Since his false prophet will do many miracles.
Especially to create belief in him, an image shall talk."[25]

Towards the close of the third century, say A. D. 270 – 300, may be placed **Victorinus of Pettaw** (see in Smith's Dictionary, *Victorinus*, No. 1, in Vol. **3**, p. 1258), who wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse. Portions of a commentary under his name are still extant, which, however, are generally regarded as interpolated, if not composed by others. From whatever hands the fragments left us may have come, the portion hereinafter translated was at all events written before the belief in Nero's return had died out. According to its author, "The seven heads are hills on which the woman — that is, the Roman power — has its seat. And there are also seven kings. . . . *One of the heads, however, was slaughtered to death, and its death-wound cured* (**Rev. 13**, 3). This means Nero. For it is certain that, when the cavalry sent by the Senate were following him, he cut his own throat. This man, resuscitated, God will send as a worthy king to worthy [subjects], and a Messiah such as the Jews have deserved. . . . He will so act, that they will call him the Messiah. But that he shall rise from the Underworld, we have already stated in the words of Isaiah, *Water shall nourish him, and the Abyss*

---

[23] **Isaiah, 14**, 16, 17.

[24] An idea borrowed probably from Sibylline predictions (see pp. 120, 121, and foot-note 8, beginning on the former) that "Three" should destroy Rome.

[25] **Commodianus**, *Instructions*, 41.

shall give him growth.[26] . . . The false prophet . . . shall cause a golden image of Antichrist to be placed in the temple of Jerusalem, and a refugee angel [that is, one of the heathen deities whom the early Christians identified with the angels that had deserted their heavenly abodes] shall enter into it [i. e. into the image] and shall thence utter words and declare [men's] fates." [27]

Next on our list chronologically should perhaps come **Lactantius,** but as there may be a question whether his undoubted writings refer to Nero's return, his statement in them is transferred for the reader's inspection to a note.[28]

There is, however, a work, *On the Death of Persecutors,* which, by many, is supposed to proceed from Lactantius; but which, by Le Nourry, has been attributed to another writer, Lucius Cæcilius, of about the same epoch; that is, about the first quarter of the fourth century. In this work we are told of Nero's persecution, and then follows a passage which implies that the confidence among Christians in Nero's return had already become somewhat weakened. Its words are: "Therefore, the impotent tyrant, cast from the height of command and rolled down from his summit, was nowhere at once to be found, so that not even a place of sepulchre

---

[26] Quoted from **Ezekiel 31,** 4, according to the Septuagint, or according to some Latin translation made therefrom. The quotation is of course from memory, though this hardly excuses such a gross misapplication of the passage.

[27] The Latin original of the above and more from the same commentary may be found in Stuart, *On the Apocalypse,* Vol. **1,** pp. 494, 495.

[28] "When the conclusion of the ages shall be at hand, a great prophet shall be sent by God . . . and, his works being finished, another king shall arise out of Syria, born of an evil spirit, an overthrower and destroyer of the human race, who shall destroy both what was left by the previous wicked one [a previously mentioned king] and also the wicked one himself. This one will contend against the prophet of God, shall conquer and kill him and allow him to lie unburied. . . . This king shall be wicked beyond measure, and a prophet of lies, and shall constitute and call himself a god and order himself to be worshipped as the Son of God, and power shall be given him to do signs and prodigies, by the sight of which he shall ensnare men to adore him. He will command fire to descend from heaven, and the sun to stand still in its course, and an image to speak." — **Lactantius,** *Div. Inst.* **7,** 17.

If we regard the extract above, from the work *On the Death of Persecutors,* as written by Lactantius, it would imply either that the foregoing passage, notwithstanding its similarity of phrascology to some other quotations about Nero, was not intended as an allusion to that monarch, but merely a description of Antichrist, whoever he might be, or else we should have to suppose that Lactantius held different views at different times.

appeared in the earth for so evil a beast. Whence some, who rave, deem him translated and reserved alive because Sibylla says that a matricide refugee should come from the bounds [of the earth], so that because he was the first persecutor he should also be the last, and should precede the advent of Antichrist. . . . In the same manner also they think that Nero will come as precursor of the Devil, and forerunner of his coming to lay waste the earth and destroy the human race." [29]

About the close of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth, lived **Sulpicius Severus,** an ecclesiastical historian, who (*Hist. Sacra*, **2,** 28, 29) gives us information that in his time the relics of former belief still found place in many minds. According to him, "Nero, . . . the basest of all men and even of monsters, was well worthy of being the first persecutor. I know not whether he may be the last, since it is the current opinion of many that he is yet to come as Antichrist. . . . It is uncertain whether he destroyed himself, . . whence it is believed that although he may have pierced himself with a sword, yet he was saved by the cure of his wound, in accordance with that which is written [**Rev. 13,** 3], *And his deadly wound was healed.* At the close of the age he is to be sent again, that he may exercise *the mystery of iniquity.*" [30]

After him comes **Augustine,** who is said to have begun his work, *De Civitate Dei*, about A. D. 413 and finished it about A. D. 426. In this work he comments as follows on the passage of **2 Thess. 2,** 7: "*Only he who restrains will restrain until he shall be done away with, and then will be revealed that wicked one.*" "I confess myself wholly ignorant," says Augustine, "of what (Paul) meant, but will not withhold such surmises of men as I have been able to hear or read on the subject. Some think that this was said of the Roman Empire, and that moreover the Apostle Paul did not wish to write it plainly lest he should incur the reproach of wishing ill to the Roman Empire, when he ought to hope that it would be eternal. So that in saying, *The mystery of iniquity already works*, he wished Nero to be understood, whose deeds already appeared as those of Antichrist. Therefore some suppose that he is to come to life again and will be Antichrist. Others indeed do not even deem him killed, but rather withdrawn, so

[29] *On the Death of Persecutors*, c. 2.
[30] De la Bigne, Bibliotheca Patrum, Vol. **7,** col. 268 D, 269 C.

that he might be regarded as killed, and suppose him to be hidden away in the vigor of that time of life in which he was when [first] thought to be destroyed, and that in his own time he will be revealed and restored to power. But the presumption of those who thus think is to me wonderful. Yet as to the apostle's statement, — *Only he who restrains will restrain until he shall be done away with*, — it is without absurdity regarded as spoken of the Roman Empire." [31] Augustine cannot have noticed that when Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, Nero had not yet become emperor.

NOTE G.

TIBERIUS.

§ 1. *His Character.*

The personal character and political tendencies of the Emperor Tiberius have an indirect connection with the general subject of this work; yet a chief motive for the following note is the desire of contributing towards an appreciation of one who, after laboring faithfully by precept and example in behalf of temperance and frugality, rectitude and kindness, has been misrepresented as a brutal and despotic debauchee.

If we ask why Tiberius should have been so traduced, there are two answers, one applicable to the charge of despotism, the other to that of debauchery. The former can be best comprehended by such as appreciate the degree in which the privileged classes had come to regard peculation, bribery, and extortion as their well-settled right.[1] When Tiberius, with

---

[31] *De Civitate Dei*, **20**, 19.

[1] "The equites abused their power, as the Senate had done before them. As farmers of the public revenues, they committed peculation and extortion with an habitual impunity, which assumed in their own view the complexion of a right. When accused they were tried by accomplices and partisans. . . . On the other hand, in prosecutions against senators of the opposite faction, the equites had more regard to political animosity than to justice. Even in ordinary cases, where party feeling was not concerned, they allowed their judicial votes to be purchased by bribery and corrupt influence."—**Smith**, *Dict. of Biog.*, **1**, p. 1079, col.

no exercise of arbitrary power, threw the whole weight of his personal and official influence against such procedures, they resented it,[2] and as they were the writers of history, their feelings have overlaid their facts. The charge of debauchery can be better weighed and understood after an examination of his life.

Before proceeding it deserves note, that Tiberius encouraged freedom of speech and neglected any disparagement of himself;[3] yet Tacitus, a lifetime later, could find no writers in

---

2, art. *Drusus, No.* 6. These remarks hold equally true of the Senate, which was generally regarded (Pliny, Jun., *Epist.* **9**, 13, § 21, quoted in Ch. X. note 104) as severe towards all faults but its own.

[2] It has already been mentioned (Note C, foot-note 18) that the presence of Tiberius in a subordinate seat at trials, prevented bribery and corruption. On this **Tacitus** remarks (*An.* **1**, 75): "Though justice was thereby furthered, liberty was impaired." This liberty can scarcely have been aught save that of wrong-doing. No hint is given that Tiberius interfered with any pretor's honest exercise of judgment. His course in the Senate precludes such supposition.

[3] "He remained unmoved at all the aspersions, scandalous reports, and lampoons which were spread against him or his relations; declaring, 'In a free state, both the tongue and the mind ought to be free.' Upon the Senate's desiring that some notice might be taken of these offences, and the persons charged with them, he replied, 'We have not so much time upon our hands that we ought to involve ourselves in more business. If you once make an opening for such proceedings, you will soon have nothing else to do. All private quarrels will be brought before you under that pretence.' There is extant also an utterance by him in the Senate *percivilis*, which is that of a model citizen. [After putting a good explanation on a perverted report of some one's language?] 'If indeed he have spoken otherwise I will make it a point to explain [to him] my actions and remarks. If he should persist, I shall reciprocate his dislike.'" — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 28, Bohn's trans. altered.

In the following we must remember that the Senate (see p. 179) had, as a stroke of policy, deified Augustus, and that Tiberius could only by defying its authority and enactments exempt any one from legally brought charges of vilifying him. "An informer [prosecutor on shares] charged Apuleia Varilia . . . with vilifying the deified Augustus, Tiberius, and his mother. . . . Tiberius desired that a distinction should be made: 'If she had spoken irreverently of Augustus she [if the words of Tiberius have not been altered] must be condemned, but for invectives against himself he would not have her called to account.' The consul asked him what were his sentiments respecting the aspersions of his mother, which the accused was charged with uttering. To this he made no answer, but at the next sitting of the Senate he prayed too in her name, 'that no words in whatsoever manner spoken against her might be imputed to any one as a crime.'" — **Tacitus,** *An.* **2**, 50, Bohn's trans. "This . . . series of sad events was interrupted by a degree of joy from the pardon extended by Tiberius to Cominius, who had been convicted of writing defamatory verses upon him." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **4**, 31, Bohn's trans. "Of

his reign who spoke evil of him.[4] That writer was certainly no friend of Tiberius, and what he says, therefore (under A. D. 23), concerning the first ten years of his administration, need not be suspected of any coloring in the emperor's favor.[5]

Prominent among the characteristics of Tiberius was moral earnestness. When a governor's rapacity had become manifest he broke off social intercourse with him; and when the man committed suicide, either to avoid the shame of condemnation or the confiscation of his ill-acquired property, Tiberius wrote to the Senate urging the impropriety of giving social standing to such a man, and condemning the idea that the disgrace of his conduct was removed, or shifted to others, by his suicide.[6]

---

disrespect towards any one, or unbelief in [the divinity of] any one, . . . he made very slight account, nor did he ever attend to such allegation [of offence] touching himself." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 9; compare note 11.

[4] "As to Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, whilst they yet reigned the histories of their times were falsified through fear; and after they had fallen, they were written under the influence of recent detestation." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **1,** 1, Bohn's trans.

[5] The following is such a recantation of statements and insinuations scattered by Tacitus through his first three books, as to suggest that those had been first published, and that, when Book **4** appeared, public opinion compelled a retraction: "All the public, and every private business of moment was managed by the Senate: to the leading members he allowed liberty of debate: those who deviated into flattery, he himself checked: in conferring preferments, he was guided by merit, by ancient nobility,(?) renown in war,(?) and distinguished civil accomplishments; insomuch that it was agreed that none had greater pretensions. The consuls and the pretors retained the usual distinctions of their offices; inferior magistrates, the exercise of their authority; and the laws, except the inquisition for bad citizenship, were beneficially administered. The tithes, taxes, and all public receipts were directed by companies of Roman knights: the management of his own estates he committed only to men of eminent probity; and to some from their reputation, though unknown to him: and when once engaged, they were continued, without any restriction of term; since most of them grew old in the same employments. . . . He took care that the provinces should not be oppressed with new impositions; and that the existing burdens should not be rendered intolerable by rapacity or severity in the magistrates: CORPORAL PUNISHMENTS AND CONFISCATIONS OF GOODS WERE UNKNOWN.

"The emperor's lands in Italy were small, and thinly scattered; the behavior [or else the number] of his slaves modest; the freedmen in his house few; his disputes with private individuals were determined by the courts and the law." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **4,** 6, 7, Bohn's trans. altered. This is the person of whom Tacitus had previously alleged (*An.* **1,** 7) that "all things disgraceful were, because of their truth, believed to have been uttered [by others]."

[6] "Pomponius Labeo, who, as I have mentioned, was governor of

Moral earnestness imparts early development, and elicits recognition thereof from others. There is hardly a better criterion of its existence than to find maturity attributed to youth, and to see age deferential towards early years. We have this testimony to Tiberius from outsiders[7] and also from a step-father who longed for his counsel in difficulty and for his personal influence in moments of irritation.[8] The fact deserves to be pondered, that the — not always seemly — jests of Augustus would die upon his lips when Tiberius approached.[9]

Moral earnestness is independent of party, and not blunted by prevalent indifference to venality. When a corrupt judge of the privileged classes needed punishment,[10] Tiberius spoke

---

Mœsia, opening his veins poured out his life-blood; his wife Paxæa, in emulation of his example, did the same. The dread of falling by the executioner made deaths of this sort a welcome resource; in addition to which, those who were condemned forfeited their estates, and were debarred the rights of burial; of such as made away with themselves, the bodies were interred, and the wills were valid, the reward of their despatch! Tiberius, however, in a letter to the Senate, argued 'that it was the usage of their ancestors [?], when they would renounce the friendship of any one, to forbid him their house, and thus put an end to all gracious intercourse: a usage he had repeated in the case of Labeo; but he who was pressed with a charge of maladministration, and other crimes, had sought to veil his guilt by an act reflecting odium upon others; while his wife had alarmed herself unnecessarily, for though guilty, she was nevertheless in no danger.'" — **Tacitus**, *An.* **6**, 29. A comparison with the foregoing of Note C, foot-note 17, implies, apparently, that the Senate, in opposition to the remonstrance of Tiberius, must, at some date since the incident there mentioned, have granted pecuniary indemnity to suicides. The appeal of Tiberius to "usage of their ancestors" (if not fabricated by Tacitus), was made to the highest code of rectitude acknowledged by the body which he was addressing.

[7] "He (Tiberius), while yet young, was called the old man because of reverence for his thoughtfulness." — **Philo**, *Embassy*, 21; *Opp.* p. 696 (Bohn's trans. **4**, pp. 130, 131).

[8] "'If anything [Augustus wrote] has occurred requiring more careful thought than usual, or at which I am angry, . . . I long for my Tiberius.'" — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 21.

[9] "I do not ignore what some have handed down, that Augustus, not secretly, but openly, so disapproved (?) his austerity, *morum diritatem*, that he sometimes, on his entrance, broke off his most careless and jovial remarks." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 21.

[10] "But in the case of Publius Suilius, formerly quæstor to Germanicus, now convicted of having taken money in an affair where he was to decree as a judge, and for which he was about to be excluded from Italy, the emperor voted for his banishment into an island, with such earnestness of feeling, that with the solemnity of an oath he declared it 'for the in-

no uncertain language, and when one of his own fiscal agents tried imposition he was equally plain.[11]

Moral earnestness — by which must not be understood personal excitability on moral questions — is apt to recognize and respect the individual responsibility of others. Tiberius recognized the individual responsibility of senators, avoided interfering with it, and did what he could to make them feel it. An instance has already been given[12] of a question in which he took much interest. Other illustrations of this trait are given below.[13]

---

terest of the commonwealth' : a proceeding which, though at the time regarded as harsh, turned afterwards to his praise, when Suilius returned to Rome ; a following age saw that exile possessed of extravagant power ; abandoned to venality, and employing his friendship with Claudius, which he long enjoyed, in all cases for his own advancement, but never in the cause of virtue." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 31, Bohn's trans. altered.

[11] "For by the Senate even yet all affairs were transacted ; insomuch that Lucilius Capito, the emperor's comptroller in Asia, was, at the accusation of that province, put upon his defence before them ; the emperor protesting with great earnestness, 'that from him Lucilius had no authority but over his slaves, and in collecting his domestic rents ; that if he had usurped the jurisdiction of pretor, and employed military force, he had so far violated his orders ; they should therefore hear the allegations of the province." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 15, Bohn's trans.

[12] See in note 6 of Ch. V. a citation from Suetonius, *Tib.* 31. It may profitably be compared with action on a similar question in the time of Trajan (see Ch. X. foot-note 59), who did not even submit it to the Senate, but decided it with his council.

[13] "In the respect he paid to individuals, or the whole body of the Senate, he went beyond all bounds. Upon his differing with Quintus Haterius in the Senate-house, 'Pardon me, sir,' he said, 'I beseech you, if I shall as a senator, speak my mind very freely in opposition to you.' . . . All affairs, whether of great or small importance, public or private, were laid before the Senate. Taxes and monopolies, the erecting or repairing edifices, levying and disbanding soldiers, the disposal of the legions and auxiliary forces in the provinces, the appointment of generals for the management of extraordinary wars, and the answers to letters from foreign princes, were all submitted to the Senate. He compelled the commander of a troop of horse, who was accused of robbery attended with violence, to plead his cause before the Senate. HE NEVER ENTERED THE SENATE-HOUSE BUT UNATTENDED ; and being once brought thither in a litter, because he was indisposed, he dismissed his attendants at the door.

"When some decrees were made contrary to his opinion, he did not even make any complaint. And though he thought that no magistrates after their nomination should be allowed to absent themselves from the city, but reside in it constantly, to fulfil their duties in person, a pretor elect obtained liberty to depart under the honorary title of a legate-at-large. . . . All other things of a public nature were likewise transacted

Moral earnestness is not fond of flattery from, nor of unmanly behavior in, others. Tiberius was no exception to this rule.[14] It is not apt to aim either at expense or display. Tiberius tried, not by force, but by precept and example, to inculcate frugality and temperance.[15] One of his efforts in

---

by the magistrates, and in the usual forms; . . . he used to rise up as the consuls approached, and give them the way.

"He reprimanded some persons of consular rank in command of armies for not writing to the Senate an account of their proceedings, and for consulting him about the distribution of military rewards; as if they themselves had not a right to bestow them as they judged proper."— **Sueton.** *Tib.* 29–32, Bohn's trans. alt'd.

Tiberius "never undertook anything of moment without communicating it to the others [the Senate]. Proposing his own view, he not only conceded to every one freedom to oppose it, but bore at times votes [or perhaps 'decrees'] contrary to his view, for he often voted. His son Drusus habitually did it in common with the other senators, sometimes first, sometimes after others; but as regards himself, sometimes he was silent; sometimes after several others [had spoken] he expressed himself fully; sometimes last of all. For the most part, that he might not seem to interfere with their freedom of utterance, his phraseology was, 'IF I WERE TO GIVE MY OPINION, I would say so and so.' This was equivalent to the usual form, yet the others were not restrained by it from speaking their minds. Often when he had given an opinion subsequent speakers took opposite ground, and sometimes carried it. Yet he never manifested anger thereat." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 7.

[14] "He had such an aversion to flattery, that he would never suffer any senator to attend his litter, either as a civility or upon business. And when a man of consular rank, in begging his pardon for some offence he had given him, attempted to fall at his feet, he started from him in such haste that he stumbled and fell. If any compliment was paid him, either in conversation or a set speech, he would not scruple to interrupt and reprimand the party, and alter what he said. Being once called 'lord' by some person, he desired that he might no more be affronted in that manner. When another, to excite veneration, called his occupations 'sacred,' and a third had expressed himself thus, 'By your authority I have waited upon the Senate,' he obliged them to change their phrases; in one of them adopting *persuasion*, instead of 'authority,' and in the other *laborious* instead of 'sacred.'" — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 27, Bohn's trans. altered. Compare Tacitus, *An.* **4,** 6, quoted in note 5.

The first of the above statements is corroborated by another writer. "When carried anywhere in his litter he did not permit any senator or any of the principal knights to follow as attendants." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 11.

[15] Although Tiberius enforced existing laws against dissipation, "yet when the senators wished to enact a penalty against profligate livers, he took no action on it, adding that it was better to reform them in some way privately, than to impose a public punishment upon them." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 13. Compare Ch. V. notes 48, 49, 55, 56.

Additional evidence that Tiberius was a temperate liver may be found in his playful criticism (**Tacitus,** *An.* **6,** 46) of persons "who after their

this direction has, like too many other of even his best deeds, been shamefully misrepresented.[16]

Frugality is sometimes connected with avarice; but all writers agree that Tiberius had no taint of the latter.[17] His

---

thirtieth year needed advice from another [that is, from a physician] as to what was physically beneficial or injurious to them"; and in the remark of **Suetonius** (*Tib.* 68), "He enjoyed excellent health, which was UNIMPAIRED DURING ALMOST HIS WHOLE TERM OF OFFICE, although after his thirtieth year he managed it according to his own judgment, without aid or counsel of physicians." Plutarch (*De Sanitate Tuenda, Opp.* **6**, p. 517, ed. Reiske; **7**, p. 407, ed. Hutten) may refer to some variation by Tiberius of his habitual remark as recorded by Tacitus, though the spirit of it is the same.

[16] Tiberius accepted from an old man, Sestius Gallus, with whom he had found some fault in the Senate, an invitation to supper (**Sueton.** *Tib.* 42) on condition "that he should change nothing from his ordinary custom," meaning, doubtless, that he should add nothing to the expense or trouble of his entertainment. Report, fabricated perhaps in a later age, charged Gallus, correctly or falsely, with being waited on by girls in a state of nudity. We can safely assume, either that the charge was fabricated by dissolute idlers as a jest at the expense of Tiberius, or, that if Gallus had ever permitted himself so gross an indecency, Tiberius was ignorant of the fact, and Gallus sure not to repeat it in his presence. Fearful as such indecency appears, the plates of Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians* (Vol. **1**, pp. 142, 143, Harper's edit.) show that it was not unknown, at least to some heathen assemblages.

[17] **Tacitus** calls him (*An.* **3**, 18) "sufficiently firm, as I have often related, against [the temptations of] money." The solitary exception which he mentions (*An.* **4**, 20) is imaginary. A public plunderer was prosecuted, and Tiberius had an accurate calculation made of what was due from him. Tacitus, copying the feelings of the aristocracy, deemed this illiberal. Elsewhere he says: "The estate of the wealthy Emilia Musa, who died intestate, and which was claimed for the prince's purse, he surrendered to Emilius Lepidus, to whose family she seemed to belong; as also to Marcus Servilius the inheritance of Patuleius, a rich Roman knight, though part of it had been bequeathed to himself; but he found Servilius named sole heir in a former and well-authenticated will, alleging that the *nobilitatem* senatorial rank of each needed pecuniary aid [to prevent forfeiture]. Nor did he ever accept any man's inheritance, but where friendship gave him a title; the wills of such as were strangers to him, and of such as, from pique to others, had appointed the prince their heir, he utterly rejected." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 48, Bohn's trans. altered.

"These [his bounties to others] he expended from his lawful revenues, for he never killed any one for the sake of riches nor yet confiscated his goods, nor did he in any instance acquire money through threats. To Æmilius Rectus, who on one occasion sent him from Egypt, of which he was governor, more than the appointed tribute, he wrote back, 'I wish you to shear, not shave, my sheep.'" — **Dio Cass. 57**, 10. "In addition to other virtues, he practised rigid abstinence from what belonged to others, never accepting legacies left him by such as had relatives." — **Dio Cass. 57**, 17.

benevolence seems to have been thoughtful,[18] and in more than one instance copious;[19] nor was it confined to pecuniary manifestations alone, but showed itself in ways which indicated an active personal interest in the welfare of others.[20]

---

[18] "About this time, Pius Aurelius the senator, whose house, yielding to the pressure of the public roads and aqueducts, had fallen, complained to the senate and prayed relief. Opposed by the pretors of the treasury, he was aided by Tiberius, who paid him the price of his house, for he was fond of being liberal upon fair occasions. . . . Upon Propertius Celer, once pretor, but now desiring leave to resign the dignity of senator on the score of poverty, he bestowed a thousand great sesterces, upon satisfactory information that his necessities were derived from his father. Others, who attempted the same thing, he ordered to prove their allegations to the Senate." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **1**, 75, Bohn's trans. altered.

"As he relieved the honest poverty of the virtuous, so he degraded from the Senate (or suffered to quit it of their own accord) Vibidius Varro, Marius Nepos, Appius Appianus, Cornelius Sylla, and Quintus Vitellius, who were spendthrifts, and brought themselves to poverty by misconduct." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 48, Bohn's trans.

"He spent VERY LITTLE ON HIMSELF, VERY MUCH ON THE COMMUNITY, . . . giving much aid to cities and private individuals. To many poor senators, who because of poverty would [could?] not attend the Senate, he gave [the requisite] wealth, yet not indiscriminately [compare Tac. *An.* **1**, 75], . . . and whatever he gave was counted to them before his eyes. Because under Augustus the paymasters appropriated to themselves large portions of such sums, [Tiberius] was rigidly on his guard that nothing of the kind should happen under him." — **Dio Cass. 57**, 10.

To Atilius Buta "confessing his poverty after an immense patrimony had been consumed, Tiberius remarked, 'You have been late in waking up.'" — **Seneca**, *Epist.* **122**, 11. The phraseology of the remark indicates anything but moral indifference to waste.

[19] Tiberius "gave largely to cities and individuals, NOR WAS HE WILLING TO ACCEPT [public] honor or praise because of his gifts." — **Dio Cass. 57**, 17. "The Sardians . . . received the greatest share of compassion, for Tiberius promised them a hundred thousand great sesterces, and remitted all their contributions to the public treasury, and the prince's privy purse, for five years." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 47, Bohn's trans. altered.

"The city was visited with a fire which raged with unusual violence, and entirely consumed Mount Cælius; . . . the emperor dissipated their murmurs by bestowing on each sufferer money to the extent of his damage: hence he had the thanks of men of rank in the Senate; and was rewarded with applause by the populace, for that without any views of ambition, or the importunities of friends, he had of his own free will SOUGHT OUT THE SUFFERERS, THOUGH UNKNOWN TO HIM, and relieved them by his bounty." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 64, Bohn's trans.

"The same year the city suffered grievously from a fire; . . . he paid the value of the houses and clusters of tenements destroyed. A hundred thousand great sesterces he expended in this bounty, which proved the more grateful to the people, as he was ever SPARING IN HIS OWN PRIVATE BUILDING." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **6**, 45, Bohn's trans.

[20] At Rhodes "one morning, in settling the course of his daily excur-

Moral earnestness is sometimes, though not always, associated with attention to life's courtesies. Tiberius practised these and the kindly offices of life equally in his retirement at Rhodes [21] and in his term of imperial power.[22] The fearful experiences, both public and private, through which he passed, would, in most men, have chilled them, yet he retained his social kindliness to the close of life.[23] His abhorrence for brutalizing games [24] did not prevent interest in such as were innocent,[25] or else in the enjoyment of those who frequented

---

sion, he happened to say that he should visit all the sick people in the town. This being not rightly understood by those about him, the sick were brought into a small portico, and ranged in order, according to their several distempers. Being extremely embarrassed by this unexpected occurrence, he was for some time irresolute how he should act; but at last he determined to go round them all, and MAKE AN APOLOGY for the mistake even to the meanest among them, and such as were entirely unknown to him." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 11, Bohn's trans.

[21] "He led entirely a private life, taking his walks sometimes about the Gymnasia, without any lictor, or other attendant, and returning the civilities of the Greeks with almost as much complaisance as if he had been upon a level with them." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 11, Bohn's trans.

[22] "He was very easy of access and ready to be spoken to. . . . When he invited them [any of the magistrates] to his table, he received them at the door and accompanied them thereto on bidding them good by. . . . He mingled with his associates as a private person. In their lawsuits he acted as an advocate; AFTER their sacrifices [did he abstain from these?] he attended their feasts; WHEN THEY WERE SICK HE WATCHED WITH [literally, 'over'] THEM, unattended by any guard; and for one of them when dead he delivered the funeral address." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 11. The gratuitous labor of advocate, according to Roman views, seems to have been in certain cases a duty not to be neglected.

[23] When the last illness of Tiberius was coming on, and some friends were supping with him, Charicles, the physician, rose to leave, kissed the hand of Tiberius and felt his pulse. He probably wished to break up the company so as not to over-fatigue him. Tiberius asked him to take his place again and continued the entertainment. Nor, when it was over, "did he abstain from HIS CUSTOM, but supporting himself on the couch, with the aid of a lictor, he addressed each as they said good-by." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 72.

[24] See Ch. V. note 6.

[25] "At 'fairs,' or whatever afforded a holiday to the multitude, he would, coming on the preceding evening to the house of some one of his tenants in the neighborhood of the gathering, spend the night there, so as to be most promptly and conveniently accessible; and he frequently watched the horse-races from the window of some one of his freedmen." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 11. In many European localities gatherings called fairs, for business or amusement, or both, are well known. In Western Pennsylvania, during its earlier settlement, landholders visited neighboring county seats during the quarterly court-sessions. This enabled even stayers at home to send payments and transact business through those

them, and among his minor habits one indicates perhaps a limited degree of playfulness.[26]

Then as now the use of a foreign language was, in many instances, a result of affectation.[27] Tiberius, though well acquainted with Greek, showed his simplicity of character, aside from other ways, by conversing in his mother tongue.[28]

Moral earnestness seeks approval from the conscience of others rather than favor from their feelings; it is not ambitious of titles nor prone to take offence. The remark of Tiberius touching dislike which he had incurred, "Let them hate if only they approve,"[29] could hardly come from any one save a conscientious man trying to do right. His dislike of titles is one among evidences of an unambitious man,[30] whilst several incidents show his absence of jealousy.[31]

---

that came. A main object of Tiberius was, doubtless, to facilitate communication with such as wished to see him.

[26] In South Germany the author found, that, if some one in the stage-coach sneezed, immediately one or more hats would be lifted with the greeting, "Your health." He has been told by travellers in Italy, that the same custom prevails there. It is two thousand years old, for the elder **Pliny** remarks (*Nat. Hist.* **28**, 5, 2): "Why *salutamus*, do we salute [or 'say health to'] a sneeze, which [custom] they say that Tiberius, the least mirthful certainly of men, exacted [when] in his carriage."

[27] "No woman thinks herself beautiful until from a Tuscan she has been metamorphosed into a miniature Greek. . . . In this language they manifest fright: in it they express joy, anger, weariness." — **Juvenal**, *Sat.* **6**, 186–189.

[28] See Suetonius, *Tib.* 71, and Dio Cassius, **57**, 15. Tiberius must, in the Senate at least, have carried this to a noticeable extent; for when he had occasion to use the word *monopoly*, he apologized for using one borrowed from a foreign language.

[29] **Sueton.** *Tib.* 59.

[30] "He did not permit himself to be called *dominum*, master, by freemen, nor emperor [literally, 'commander'], *imperatorem*, except by the soldiers; he wholly refused the appellation, 'father of his country.' He did not add [to his signature] the title Augustus [or august] (which he never permitted to be voted him), but tolerated it when spoken or written [to himself], and as often as he corresponded with certain kings he himself added it. He was commonly called Cæsar, occasionally Germanicus, from his deeds in Germany, and, even by himself, according to old custom, Primate (or presiding officer) of the Senate. He said that, 'I am master of my slaves, commander of the soldiers, but primate of the others.' And prayed, when the question came up, that he might live and rule [only] so long as beneficial to the public. Thus in all things he behaved so much as a private man, that he would not permit anything unusual on his birthday." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 8. Cp. note 14.

[31] "Rufus Helvius, a common soldier, acquired the glory of saving a citizen, and was, by Apronius, presented with the spear and collar. Tiberius added the civic crown, complaining rather than offended that

Tiberius had in early life proved himself an able and humane general.[32] During his reign he maintained peace.[33] This peacefulness was the result neither of thoughtless sentiment nor of indolence, as is evident from his early life and from the energy of his dealings with the freebooter Tacfarinas, and with robbers and rogues generally.[34] The same love of peace showed itself in his private relations and in his dislike of trifling accusations. At Rhodes he interposed as peacemaker between sophists who had quarrelled; and his only exercise, during eight years' stay there, of his authority as a magistrate was to imprison a man whose fault-finding must have tended to start the quarrel afresh.[35] A wish to conciliate furnishes the most probable explanation of the apple offered to Agrippina, his ambitious daughter-in-law.[36] His dislike of trifling

---

Apronius had not in his own right as proconsul granted that also. . . . Tiberius . . . granted to Blæsus that he should be by the legions saluted *Imperator* [commander, emperor]. . . . Junia, . . . sister of M. Brutus and wife of C. Cassius, . . . having honorably distinguished with legacies almost all the great men of Rome, she omitted Tiberius, — an omission which drew from him no indications of offended dignity, nor did he hinder her panegyric from being pronounced from the rostra, nor her funeral from being celebrated with all the other customary solemnities." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **3,** 21, 74, 76, Bohn's trans.

[32] See Suetonius, *Tib.* 9, 16–19.

[33] "Tiberius, . . . who never allowed any seed of war to smoulder or to raise its head either in Greece or in the territory of the barbarians, and who bestowed peace and the blessings of peace up to the end of his life with a rich and most bounteous hand and mind upon the whole empire and the whole world." — **Philo,** *Embassy,* 21, Bohn's trans. "The matter upon which I am occupied is . . . a state of UNDISTURBED PEACE, or only interrupted in a limited degree . . . and A PRINCE INDIFFERENT ABOUT EXTENDING THE BOUNDS OF THE EMPIRE." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **4,** 32, Bohn's trans.

[34] Tacitus, *An.* **3,** 73, 74.

[35] "One instance only is mentioned in which he appeared to exercise his tribunitian authority. Being a constant attendant upon the schools and lecture-rooms of the professors of the liberal arts, on occasion of a quarrel among the wrangling sophists in which he interposed to reconcile them, some person took the liberty to abuse him as an intruder and partial in the affair. Upon this, withdrawing privately home, he suddenly returned attended by his officers, and summoning his accuser before his tribunal by a public crier, ordered him to be taken to prison." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 11, Bohn's trans.

[36] He had, in answer to some of her importunities, taken her hand and remarked, "You think, my child, if you do not rule, that an injury is done you." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 53. Compare Tacitus, *An.* **4,** 52. At table, after this conversation, Agrippina seems to have been too ill-humored to eat. Tiberius commended some apples, picked one out and handed it to her. She threw it to one of the servants. Tiberius remarked to his

charges may have been due partly to his sense of justice and partly to his love of peace.[37]

Moral earnestness looks upon power as a trust. Tiberius alone among all the emperors laid before the Senate, when entering upon office, a detailed statement of his trust.[38] At the close of life his anxiety was conscientious as to its transmission.[39] He seems to have preferred certain, rather than severe, punishments,[40] and to have avoided such as degrade men or diminish self-respect.[41]

---

mother that she treated it as if poisoned. (Tacitus, *An.* **4**, 54.) The leading facts as mentioned by Tacitus are here narrated, but without his interpretation of them.

[37] On one occasion, when two individuals consecutively had been charged with disrespect for the divinity of Augustus, Tiberius wrote to the consuls "that the object in deifying his father was not to facilitate the destruction of citizens."—**Tacitus,** *An.* **1**, 73. On another occasion (**Tac.** *An.* **1**, 74) a persistent attempt was made in the Senate to fasten on a man some charge of conversation disrespectful to Tiberius. It was skilfully concluded with an allegation that the accused had cut the head from a statue of Augustus and substituted a head of Tiberius. This, it was probably supposed, would prevent the emperor from advocating the man's cause, lest he should thereby seem to count himself above Augustus. Tiberius for once lost patience, and said that he also in this case would give his opinion and under oath, so as to compel a like course on the part of the Senate. Piso, a senator of independent character, restored the emperor's equanimity by calling out to him, "In what place, Cæsar, will you vote? If first, I shall have something to guide me; if after all others, I fear that I might incautiously dissent from you." This sarcasm on the lack of manliness in the Senate recalled Tiberius apparently to a consciousness that the accuser was appealing, not to any supposed sensitiveness in himself, but to senatorial servility. He quietly "gave his opinion *tulit* [*sententiam*] that the defendant should be acquitted of [these] charges of bad citizenship." Some pecuniary charges were referred to the civil tribunal.

[38] Tacitus, *An.* **1**, 11.

[39] Tacitus represents in his *Annals* (**6**, 46), that Tiberius, in his last days, weighed carefully the qualifications, as a successor, of his grandson, of his brother's grandson Caligula, of his nephew Claudius, and THOUGHT EVEN OF PERSONS NOT BELONGING TO HIS OWN FAMILY. No one fully satisfied him and he did not make a choice. **Tacitus** adds (*Ibid.*): "FAVOR WITH COTEMPORARIES WAS TO HIM OF LESS MOMENT THAN THE EFFORT FOR HONOR AMONG POSTERITY." Tacitus, on this point, gives his testimony without, apparently, appreciating its value.

[40] No reliable record exists of any one having been put to death by Tiberius. "He gave special attention to preserving the peace [i. e. the public security] against bandits, robbers, and mob violence. . . . He rigidly repressed popular tumults and guarded against their occurrence. When slaughter had been caused by quarrel in a theatre, he banished the leaders of the faction and the players who were its cause, nor could he by any prayers of the people be forced into recalling them."—**Sueton.** *Tib.* 37.

[41] Corporal punishments were unknown in his time. See note 5.

Justice loves openness in questions of public administration. Tiberius exerted himself to secure open and fair hearing as well as intelligent decision.[42] His selection of men who could, during a lifetime, retain office satisfactorily to those whom they ruled,[43] attests not only his good sense and scrupulous consideration of character, but also his moral sense, since a deficiency in this direction would have precluded any such result. Two governors of his appointment have been sketched or mentioned by monotheists. One of them, Flaccus, is portrayed by Philo, his unscrupulous enemy.[44] Of another, Pilate, we have some view in Josephus and the Gospels.[45]

Although the surroundings of Tiberius, and many circumstances in his life, must have tended to repress affectionateness in his manner, yet two or three recorded instances show that it not only dwelt within, but that it occasionally showed itself.

---

[42] "He never transacted business alone with the envoys from cities or nations, but always appointed a number as participants in the investigation, and especially those who had once been their governors." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 17.

[43] "This, too, was part of the policy of Tiberius, to continue persons in offices, and for the most part to maintain them in the same military authority or civil employments to the ends of their lives." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **1,** 80, Bohn's trans. No governor appointed by Tiberius was ever, while alive, charged with, or prosecuted for, malversation in office.

[44] See Ch. V. note 66.

[45] Josephus pictured Pilate with no friendly pen, yet he furnishes, with his usual embellishments, the following facts. The Roman soldiers came from Cæsarea to Jerusalem by night, — possibly to diminish chances of offence. The Jews objected to the images on their standards (*Antiq.* **18,** 3, 1). Pilate, after finding that the matter might cause trouble, sent, though not without a little delay, the images back to Cæsarea. He found that the city needed water, and that a large sum of money was lying in the temple useless, or probably worse than useless, since unprincipled men must have found means to misuse it (compare Ch. II. notes 33, 34). He took the money, made an aqueduct (*Antiq.* **18,** 3, 2), and repressed the mob which followed. Josephus shows him to have been energetic, utilitarian, and gifted with administrative power.

If we turn to the Gospels we find that before this Pilate a man was brought whom the leading Jews were determined to have put to death. Pilate tried hard to save him, but in order to accomplish it must have incurred risk of an accusation from the conservative Jews, who, in the existing state of parties at Rome, after the death of Sejanus, could have effected his ruin. This he had not, apparently, nerve to meet. But the governor who could not, to save himself, permit the execution of an innocent peasant — for such Jesus must have seemed to him — without repeated effort in his behalf (Matt. **27,** 17–26; Mark, **15,** 10–15; Luke, **23,** 4, 14–25; John, **18,** 38; **19,** 4–16) was not indifferent to justice. He had a keen conscience, though his moral strength did not equal the demand upon it.

The final parting from his first wife, and the efforts to prevent his ever seeing her again, admit no explanation unless he were affectionate.[46] His joy when he became a grandfather implies fairly the same quality in his old age,[47] and his behavior at the death of Augustus is most naturally explained by the same characteristic. None but an affectionate person would, under the circumstances mentioned in note 36, have taken the hand of the person whom he addressed.

The repugnance of Tiberius for any manifestation of divine

---

[46] "Our children . . . are [judicially] in our own power, which right is a peculiarity of Roman citizens, for there are almost no other men who have such power over their children as we [Romans]." — **Gaius**, *Instit.* **1**, 55; edit. Boecking, p. 20. By Roman law, if a son, or adopted son, married, "his wife came into the power of his father and not into the power of the son. The son's children were . . . in the power of their grandfather." — **Smith**, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 873, col. 2. In March of B. C. 12, an era when reactionary ideas and measures were at their height, Julia, the emperor's daughter, lost her husband. Augustus, προαποσπάσας first tearing away from him [Tiberius] his wife, . . . betrothed Julia to him and sent him against the Pannonians." — **Dio Cass. 54**, 31. Another account says: "He was compelled [by whom?] hurriedly to dismiss her [Vipsania Agrippina] and marry Julia, not without great anguish of mind, as he loved Agrippina's society. . . . Even after the divorce he grieved for having put Agrippina away, and in the only instance of casual meeting with her, gazed after her with eyes so earnest and full of tears, that care was taken [by whom?] to prevent her ever again coming into his sight." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 7. It is barely possible that Augustus, in this matter, acted of his own accord. It is much more probable that his scheming, plotting wife — whom her great-grandson styled "Ulysses in petticoats" — managed the matter, and abused, in his name, his legal authority. Even Tiberius, in his mature years, could not prevent her doing in his name (see note 51) things offensive to him, and Augustus would have been less a match for her. Possibly the divorce may have been effected after, instead of before, the departure of Tiberius.

Tiberius deferred, for two years, marrying Julia. This was (Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 741, col. 2) the longest legal limit for a betrothal. When she was banished at a later date by her father, her husband was thoughtful and considerate. He asked (Suetonius, *Tib.* 11) in repeated letters, that any presents which he had given her might not be taken away. The previously divorced wife of Tiberius was subject to legal penalties (see Ch. VII. note 77) if she did not remarry in six months. She married Asinius Gallus (mentioned in Ch. VII. note 102), between whom and her first husband friendship seems to have remained unbroken. He is mentioned by Dio Cassius (**58**, 3) as dining with Tiberius in A. D. 30, and as receiving from him a guard against his enemies.

[47] "Livia, sister of Germanicus, wife of Drusus, gave birth to twin boys, which . . . caused the prince so much joy, that he could not refrain from boasting (?) to the Fathers, that to no Roman, previously, of the same rank, had twins been born." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 84.

honor towards mortals[48] may have been due to his moral sense, but is so strong as almost to indicate monotheistic leanings. It was certainly not due to any regard for the heathen religion.[49]

§ II. *His Retirement to Capreæ.*

Augustus had acquired the island of Capreæ as a pleasant country residence.[50] Tiberius built twelve or more tasteful villas upon it, and retired thither in A. D. 26, with a select number of friends, men of culture and of business capacity. Several reasons may have prompted him to this. He was almost seventy, and may have needed respite from the fatigues of city life. He may also have felt that if he lived separately from his mother, it would be more difficult for her to com-

---

[48] "No sacred place was ever at his prompting, or otherwise, set apart for him. Neither was it lawful for any one to set up his image; for from the first he in plain terms forbade either a city or individual to do it. He indeed added to the prohibition, '*unless I shall permit it*,' but subjoined verbally, '*I will not permit it.*'" — **Dio Cass. 57,** 9. "He forbade that temples or either class of priests should be decreed him, or even that his statues and images should be set up without his permission; and this he gave only on condition that they should not be placed among images of the gods, but among household ornaments." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 26. He vetoed (Tacitus, *An.* **5,** 2) any deification of his mother. When obsequious persons offered sacrifice to him and Sejanus (Dio Cass. **58,** 3), "he forbade that sacrifice should be offered TO ANY HUMAN BEING." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 2. **Velleius Paterculus,** while defending and lauding the bearing of Tiberius towards Augustus, admits (**2,** 126) that "he has not called . . . him god." The temple voted by the Senate to Augustus received no dedication from Tiberius. Whether Caligula (see p. 100) dedicated it as merely ἡρῷον, a hero monument (Dio Cass. **59,** 7) may be a question; as also whether Domitian parried in a similar way (Dio Cass. **67,** 2) the deification of his brother.

[49] Tiberius "was *negligentior*, rather negligent in regard to the gods and religious observances because (?) addicted to astrology." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 69. Drusus his son was blamed, by the patrician party doubtless, for neglecting the GODS OF ROME and the initiatory auspices (see Tac. *An.* **3,** 59). It deserves note, also, that the daughter of this Drusus, when expelled from Rome, was mourned most publicly by a friend who was subsequently charged with foreign superstition, that is, with monotheism. See pp. 241, 242.

[50] "Augustus, having taken a fancy to Capreæ, . . . took possession of it as part of the imperial domain, giving the Neapolitans in exchange the far more wealthy island of Ænaria. . . . He appears to have visited it repeatedly. . . . Tiberius . . . erected not less than twelve villas in different parts of the island. . . . Excavations in modern times have brought to light mosaic pavements, bas-reliefs, cameos, gems, and other relics of antiquity." — **Smith,** *Dict. of Geog.* **1,** p. 509, col. 2.

According to the **New Am. Cyclopædia** (art. *Capri*), the island "is

promise him, and he would avoid any need of controlling her.[51] Yet further, he may have noticed steps of the aristocracy towards a rebellion such as subsequently broke out, and he may have felt that, by living at some distance from the city, he could escape the need of measures for self-protection. The published statements of treasury disbursements ceased from the date when he left Rome (Dio Cass. **59**, 9), a pretty sure evidence that his enemies were misapplying these disbursements. Among the companions of this retirement was the eminent jurist Nerva, against whom not even his political enemies have a word to allege;[52] Flaccus, the statesman and man of culture, gifted with uncommon administrative ability, and whose abode at Alexandria was the seat of refinement;[53]

---

still celebrated for the beauty of its climate, . . . is about nine miles in circumference," and is frequented by quails, "vast numbers of which are caught every spring and autumn on their passage from and to Africa."

The relics in these villas, as well as passages of the elder Pliny, convey the impression that Tiberius had a liking for the fine arts. Pliny specifies two paintings (a Gallic high-priest, *Nat. Hist.* **35**, 36, 10; and a bather using the *strigil*, or scraper, *Nat. Hist.* **34**, 19, 13) as having especially commended themselves to the emperor.

[51] "She was greatly puffed up beyond all women who preceded her. . . . Except that she did not venture upon entering the Senate, the camps, or the assemblies, she endeavored to administer all things as if sole ruler; eventually [Tiberius] excluded her entirely from public affairs, while allowing her control of matters at home. Then as she proved, even in these matters, a burden, he often left home and in every way avoided her, so that she was by no means the least of his reasons for removing to Capreæ." — **Dio Cass. 57**, 12.

This mother must have severely tried her son's sense of justice and propriety. At one time a lady, unwilling to pay her debts, took refuge with the mother, who insisted (Tac. *An.* **2**, 34) that Tiberius should have the proceedings against her stopped. At another she had determined (Dio Cass. **57**, 12) to DEDICATE a statue to Augustus [as a god], and to make a great feast for the senators, knights, and their wives. Tiberius obviated the impropriety by feasting the men and letting her take the women. He required as a preliminary to the statue, that the Senate should vote assent. She must, then or subsequently, have carried her point, for, much to his disgust, she not only dedicated a statue (Tac. *An.* **3**, 64), but added his name to her own as concerned in the performance, a total misrepresentation (see note 48) of his position on such matters. In much of this she was doubtless the unconscious tool of patricians.

[52] Nerva was a law-pupil of the Labeo mentioned on pp. 171, 172, and is lauded by **Tacitus** (*An.* **6**, 26) as "acquainted with all law, human and divine."

[53] See Ch. V. notes 66, 82. Flaccus must have remained among the intimate companions of Tiberius until sent in A. D. 32 as governor to Egypt, and, if Philo can be trusted (*Against Flaccus*, 3, Bohn's trans. Vol. **4**, p. 63; Paris edit. p. 663, ll. 29–31), he, when Tiberius died, grieved as for a personal friend.

Macro, combining the qualities of military commander with those of moralist and teacher;[54] and Curtius Atticus, a Roman knight. He was also accompanied by Greek and Latin scholars.[55] His respected and cherished sister-in-law Antonia (with not improbably the wives of some among the officers) contributed, occasionally at least, feminine influence to this select society.[56]

Tiberius at Capreæ must have continued his previously industrious habits. He left *Memoirs*, part, at least, of which were written here, for they included matters occurring after he left Rome. His attention to the political and financial interests of the community suffered no diminution.[57] In his

---

[54] Macro's military qualities are attested not merely by the office to which the disciplined judgment of Tiberius appointed him, but by his prompt suppression of the prearranged patrician rebellion of A. D. 31. His moral qualities are portrayed by Philo, who at least had means of knowing, for Herod Agrippa, the father-in-law of Philo's niece, lived for a time at Capreæ, associating much with the young Caligula, for whose moral training Macro seems to have exerted himself. According to Philo (*Embassy*, 7, 8), Macro tried faithfully, in his intercourse with Caligula, to give him good aims, so that the latter on meeting him would say, 'Here is . . . the pedagogue.' — **Philo,** Paris edit. p. 687; Bohn's trans. **4,** p. 111.

[55] "His departure was with a small number of companions: one CONSULAR senator, Cocceius Nerva, skilled in the laws; a Roman knight, Curtius Atticus, who, as well as Sejanus, was among the distinguished ones; others gifted in liberal studies, chiefly Greeks, by whose conversation he might be refreshed." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **4,** 58.

[56] Antonia was a daughter of Marc Antony and of Octavia, sister to Augustus. **Smith's** *Dictionary* (art. *Antonia*, 6) mentions her as "celebrated for her beauty, virtue, and chastity." **Josephus** says (*Antiq.* **18,** 6, 6) that "she was in all respects honored by Tiberius," and mentions her (*Antiq.* **18,** 6, 4; cp. 6) among the society of his retirement. She was probably a monotheist, for not only was her intimate friend in early days a Jewess, but her business agent and superintendent of her estates in Alexandria was the Jewish ethnarch in that city, brother of Philo. Further: though her husband had been senatorial in politics, yet the Senate for some reason ignored herself until a grandson, whom they hoped to please, sat upon the throne. Then in a single decree (Sueton. *Calig.* 15) they, for the sake, doubtless, of currying favor, voted her all the honors which had ever been conferred on Livia. This was overshooting the mark, since it made her, among other things, Priestess of Augustus. The relations of Antonia to her dependents are illustrated by the remark of Cænis, her freedwoman (subsequently the cherished wife of Vespasian), who, when told to forget something, replied, "It is useless, mistress, to give me such a direction, for these and all other things which you tell me are so fixed in my mind, that it is impossible to forget them." — **Dio Cass. 66,** 14.

[57] "He paid exceeding attention that they [the Senate] should convene

benevolence, which continued to be frequent and copious,[58] it is noteworthy that the younger members of his family were called upon for responsible and arduous duty.[59] His superintendence of his own fiscal matters must have been good, for, in spite of benevolence and absence of avarice, he left a large fortune.[60] The rules of social morality which he had laid down in public[61] were, if we may believe Josephus, carried out with equal strictness in his retirement.[62] His offices of kindness were not forgotten, and when Nerva was on his death-bed the friend who watched by his side was Tiberius.[63] His

---

as often as duty required, and that they should neither meet later than appointed, nor be dismissed earlier. On this head he repeatedly gave injunctions to the consuls, and sometimes directed things to be read by them [to the Senate] which he was accustomed to do in reference to other kinds of business, as if he could not write directly to the Senate." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 21, under A. D. 33; see also in the next note the attention of Tiberius to financial matters.

[58] Tiberius in A. D. 27 relieved the sufferers by a fire (Tacitus, *An.* **4,** 64), and in A. D. 33 relieved a financial crisis (Dio Cass. **58,** 21) by lending without interest. Multitudes, of course, needed this relief, and it could be safely given only after examination of their assets. In A. D. 36 he relieved (Dio Cass. **58,** 26) sufferers by inundation. In the same year (Tacitus, *An.* **6,** 45, quoted in note 19) he relieved the sufferers by an extensive fire.

[59] "For estimating each one's loss, the four husbands of Cæsar's granddaughters, Cneius Domitius, Cassius Longinus, Marcus Vinicius, Rubellius Blandus, were selected; Publius Petronius being added by nomination of the consuls." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **6,** 45. A member of the committee who apportioned relief in Pittsburgh, after the great fire of 1845, spoke of it to me as among the most arduous of undertakings. Misrepresentation had to be detected, and the various circumstances affecting valuation to be discerned and weighed.

[60] Sueton. *Calig.* 37.

[61] See views of Tiberius in note 6.

[62] According to **Josephus** (*Antiq.* **18,** 6, 4), Herod Agrippa, subsequently king, came to visit Tiberius and met with a kindly reception. Trustworthy advice, promptly following, said that his object was to avoid creditors and honest debts. Tiberius "was greatly pained on perusing this epistle," and declined further intercourse while the debts were unpaid, which was therefore soon effected. Perhaps Tiberius had yet other advice (see p. 99) concerning Herod, and merely tolerated him in kindness to Antonia.

[63] The nature of Nerva's death renders probable that he suffered from weakness of stomach, as did his grandson, the Emperor Nerva, and perhaps, also, that, like his grandson, he may have been more distinguished by gentle goodness than by rugged strength. An attempted enforcement of usury laws had produced, in A. D. 33, financial disorder and distress. Nerva, in the midst of it, was, according to Dio Cassius (**58,** 21), depressed by anticipations of fraud and disturbance. If he could be

thoughtfulness in the administration of business was unabated; and when, in A. D. 32, the governor of Egypt died, he temporarily sent one of his freedmen thither,[64] thus giving himself leisure to select a successor, Flaccus, who approved himself in the office.[65]

The residence at Capreæ was diversified by occasional visits elsewhere.[66] During it most of the emperor's grandchildren, adoptive or otherwise, were married. One of them, Caligula, chose a wife whose father belonged to the bitter opponents of Tiberius, yet the latter does not seem to have made any objections, nor to have altered his relations towards Caligula because of it.

Tacitus and Suetonius, unsupported by Dio Cassius, tell us that Tiberius, retiring to Capreæ when he was almost threescore years and ten, commenced a round of debauchery so vile that a modern brothel would be decent in comparison. The story, originated in a poor joke,[67] was propagated by party malignity, and countenanced by prevalent dissoluteness. It would deserve no notice, save for the wide credence which it has received.

§ III. *Patrician Revolt of A. D.* 31.

At the death of Augustus the patricians had arranged measures, which proved abortive, to prevent the accession of

---

depressed, his nervous system must already have been shocked by partisan murders at Rome. Tiberius sought to encourage him, as also to elicit his views on the course to be pursued. Tenderness of friendship, one might think, should escape defamation, but the traducers of Tiberius represent the death of Nerva as due to voluntary starvation caused by his weariness of the emperor.

[64] **Dio Cass. 58,** 19.

[65] See Ch. V. note 66.

[66] Suetonius mentions (*Tib.* 40) a visit to the continent, which must have been in A. D. 27; Tacitus (*An.* **4,** 74) relates a visit in the year 28 to Campania; Dio Cassius mentions (**58,** 3) a hospitality towards Gallus in A. D. 30, which seems to imply proximity to the city; and (**58,** 21) a residence in A. D. 33 in the suburbs of Rome, and repeated visits thither (**58,** 24) about the close of the same year; and a stay (**58,** 25) at Antium in A. D. 35; Tacitus speaks (*An.* **6,** 39) of Tiberius as near Rome in the last-mentioned year; Josephus speaks (*Antiq.* **18,** 6, 6) of events in A. D. 36, during a stay in the neighborhood of Tusculum, a locality twelve or fifteen miles from Rome, where wealthy citizens had their country residences, and at the date of his last illness, in A. D. 37, Tiberius was at Misenum.

[67] The name of the island, Capreæ, or Capri, led some one to call him *Caprineus*, which might mean, either a resident in Capri, or, by a play on words, a grossly dissolute man.

Tiberius. In A. D. 19, 20, they were planning rebellion, with Germanicus as a leader. His death aided in breaking up their projects. In A. D. 31 a patrician outbreak took place; the widow of Germanicus being either its nominal head or among its active managers. Some prelude to it occurred in the previous year, as we may infer from the appointment of a military guard to protect a popular leader.[68] The outbreak was prearranged, for one or more vessels put to sea in Greece; and by those interested, a son of Germanicus was alleged to accompany, or head, the expedition,[69] which had for its object the invasion of Syria or Egypt.

---

[68] "On the same day that [Gallus] dined with Tiberius, drinking with him in friendship, he was condemned by a decree of the Senate; so that a pretor was sent to bind him and lead him to punishment. And yet Tiberius acting thus(?) . . . exhorted him to be of good courage, [directing] that he be guarded without bonds until he [Tiberius] himself should come to the city; . . . and he was guarded by the consuls save in the consulship of Tiberius, for then he was guarded by the pretors." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 3.

[69] "About the same time Greece and Asia were dismayed by a rumor more rife than lasting, 'that Drusus, a son of Germanicus, had been seen in the Cyclades, and soon afterwards upon the continent.' And there was indeed a youth nearly of the same age, to whom some of the emperor's freedmen, as if he were recognized by them, attached themselves, with the purpose [?] of betraying him. The unwary were allured by the splendor of the name, the Greeks being prone to catch at anything new and marvellous; so much so that they imagined, 'that, escaped from custody and proceeding to the armies of his father, he *would invade Syria or Egypt.*' He was now attended by a crowd of young men, and thronged with eager partisans, elated with his present success and airy hopes, when the story reached Poppæus Sabinus. He was at that juncture engaged in Macedonia, and likewise had charge of Greece; to obviate the mischief, whether the account were true or false, he hastily passed the bay of Torone and that of Therme; and presently reached Eubœa, an island of the Ægean Sea, and Piræus, on the coast of Attica; he then passed along the coast of Corinth, and the straits of the Isthmus; and, by another sea, entered Nicopolis, a Roman colony. There at length he learned, that, being shrewdly questioned, he had declared himself the son of Marcus Silanus; and that many of his followers having fallen off, he had embarked, as if he meant to sail to Italy. Sabinus sent this account to Tiberius, and further than this we have found nothing [?] of the origin or issue of that affair." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **5,** 10, Bohn's trans. The young man, according to Dio Cassius (**58,** 25), was sent to Tiberius. Silanus, father of the boy here mentioned, was one of the high aristocracy, consul during the reactionary proceedings of A. D. 19. His lack of moral sensibility was shown in A. D. 20, by his public, instead of private, thanks for the permitted return of a brother who had disgraced himself. Tacitus when writing the above must have known that the expedition was part of a prearranged senatorial rebellion.

The consuls, at the date of the rebellion, were Trio and Regulus. The former was an unscrupulous politician with whom Tiberius had at one time declined intercourse, and who had afterwards wished to make himself prominent, in the year 20, as a prosecutor of the emperor's friend Piso.[70] Regulus does not seem to have intended rebellion, but to have been entrapped by fraud into giving it unintentional aid.[71] The time selected for it was coincident with a change in the command of the pretorian cohorts. Sejanus had been their commander, much to the chagrin of the ultra aristocracy, — who felt galled at seeing one of an inferior order acting as the emperor's right-hand man,[72] — and of Agrippina, who deemed him an opponent of her aims. Tiberius, with no unfriendliness towards him,[73] found reasons for substituting Macro, a man on kindly terms with Sejanus.

Macro reached Rome at night, communicated his authorization to one of the consuls, Regulus, and to Laco, commander

---

[70] See p. 192.

[71] After the rebellion was crushed "Trio . . . had indirectly blamed Regulus as backward in crushing the agents of Sejanus. He . . . not only repelled his colleague, but brought him to an investigation as guilty of conspiracy." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **5**, 11.

[72] This statement scarcely needs proof, but abundant evidence in its support may be found in Velleius Paterculus, **2**, 128. That author, writing whilst his friend Sejanus was in power, quotes a long list of distinguished individuals, not of patrician ancestry, who, because of their merits, had been elevated to high position at Rome. He argues that Tiberius, the Senate, and the people had but followed ancient precedent in elevating an unusually competent man. The argument implies a class who decried Sejanus because of his origin: It is but fair to give this friend's opinion of Sejanus: "A man most genial [even] in gravity; of pristine cheerfulness; laborious without showing it; totally unassuming, and for that reason heaped with honors; always measuring himself below the estimate of others; tranquil in countenance and disposition; of sleepless mental activity." — **Vel. Pater. 2**, 127.

[73] **Suetonius** (*Tib.* 61) RESTATES, or quotes from a restatement by some one else, a passage from the Memoirs of Tiberius, "that he had punished [?] Sejanus because he had found him filled with animosity against the children of his son Germanicus." *Sejanum se punisse quod comperisset furere adversus liberos Germanici filii sui.* This passage is not quoted verbally, for it is written in the third person. Had the Memoir by Tiberius assumed responsibility for the proceedings against Sejanus, Tacitus would have been but too thankful to quote what would have saved him much inconclusive reasoning. The passage, in its most obvious sense, is so plainly contradicted by other evidence, as to show that the meaning of Tiberius has been perverted. The term "punished" has been substituted for *removed from office*, or for some equivalent expression. Compare note 97.

of the night watch. The Senate met on the next morning in Apollo's temple. Macro saw and held a conversation with Sejanus, who, "in excellent spirits over it, hurried into the Senate house." He then replaced the day watch by the night one, perhaps because of trust in Laco; entered the temple and gave a letter of Tiberius to the consuls; charged Laco to watchfulness, and went himself to the camp.

The letter of Tiberius was opened. "It was long and NOT DIRECTED AGAINST SEJANUS."[74] It certainly did not contemplate his death, and there can hardly be a question that it contained no suggestion or desire of death to any one.[75] It ordered a guard for Sejanus, as a protection, doubtless, against his enemies. During its perusal, if Dio's narrative be correct, some of the senators — perhaps by prearrangement — left the side of Sejanus. A fictitious tumult was created, and his more timorous friends were cowed. No distinct motion seems to have been before the Senate. The proceedings of the conspirators can be judged from the following: The consul "Regulus [?] did not ask the votes of all, nor [even] OF A SINGLE ONE CONCERNING PUTTING HIM [Sejanus] TO DEATH, but being afraid lest some one should oppose, and a disturbance be made, — since (Sejanus) had many relatives and friends, — having asked some ONE and received assent, that he should be bound, he led him out of the Senate and into prison."[76] Sejanus would, perhaps, have been safe on his own side of the house, but had been lured by a fraud among his enemies.[77] Laco, seeing his danger, came into the Senate room, took place by his side and accompanied him to prison, but may not, at that stage of the proceedings, have felt warranted in entering upon a conflict with the consul.

---

[74] **Dio Cass. 58,** 10.

[75] The conspirators, and writers influenced by them, have done their best to pervert this letter into an apology for their crimes. According to Dio Cassius (**58,** 10) it treated various matters, found briefly some fault with Sejanus in two passages, spoke near its close of two senators, friends of Sejanus, as deserving punishment [?], and directed A GUARD TO BE PLACED OVER SEJANUS.

[76] **Dio Cass. 58,** 10. The impression conveyed by the above, that Regulus headed the action against Sejanus, is a misrepresentation which Dio has innocently copied.

[77] Regulus, according to Dio Cass. (**58,** 10), called two or three times to Sejanus and motioned him with his hand to come to him. Sejanus, inattentive at first, asked if he were calling to him, and crossed over, on the supposition, apparently, that he wished to hold some conversation with him. If this be true, Regulus was used by the conspirators without knowing their object.

Shortly afterwards, on the same day, another meeting of the Senate — to which were summoned probably only the conspirators and those whom they could control — took place at the temple of Concord near the prison. A mob had been excited against Sejanus, and because the Senate saw this, and "SAW NOT ONE OF THE [PRETORIAN] GUARDS,"[78] they condemned him to death. The quoted passage is evidence, if other were wanting, that no aid was expected from Macro. Sejanus, his children,[79] and many adherents of the popular party were brutally murdered.[80]

The mangled body of Sejanus was knocked about during three days before being thrown into the Tiber.[81] How long the conspirators held sway is uncertain. They were unquestionably subdued before the year closed, and perhaps within a week or two. Not a soldier from elsewhere seems to have been needed, and the fleet which Tiberius held ready[82] was not called into requisition. The conspirators had to provide for their own safety. They made offers to Macro and Laco, who

---

[78] **Dio Cass. 58,** 11.

[79] **Dio Cass. 58,** 11. The little daughter of Sejanus, a mere child, had, according to Tacitus (*An.* **5,** 9), been violated before execution, — a fate shared by others, if we may trust Suetonius. The senatorial faction, in whose service this was done, must, when on their defence, have tried to coat over the atrocity with religious varnish. "Because, according to traditional custom, it was impious to strangle immature girls." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 61. "As if it were impious, that a virgin should be executed in prison." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 11. "Because it was deemed unheard of, that a virgin should be subjected to triumviral punishment." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **5,** 9. The triumviral court was one for "summary," even capital, "punishment upon slaves and persons of lower rank." — **Smith,** *Dict. of Antiq.* 1167, 1168. Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio quote this wretched attempt at an apology, as if they believed that the brute of an executioner was prompted by reverence for religion. Tacitus assumes to be a moralist. His indignation elsewhere (*An.* **1,** 76, quoted on p. 180) contrasts unfavorably with its absence here.

[80] These murders expressly violated a humane enactment which Tiberius had ten years previously introduced, that "no one condemned by them [the Senate] should be executed within ten days, nor within that time should the decree be deposited in the treasury." — **Dio Cass. 57,** 20. A passage of Suetonius (*Tib.* 55) renders probable that some of the victims were from a council of twenty, who aided Tiberius in governing the city. Compare with it Caligula's statement to the Senate in the next section.

[81] **Dio Cass. 58,** 11.

[82] Tiberius kept his fleet ready to depart at a moment's notice (Dio Cass. **58,** 13; Sueton. *Tib.* 65), and had signals and watchers arranged, probably against the contingency of a naval effort by the conspirators, or against any outside disturbance.

refused to listen.[83] They voted honors to Tiberius. He forbade their consideration.[84] An embassy of their leading men went to see him. They found no admission. The consul Regulus tried it. He fared no better.[85]

The conspirators, while holding control, had, as a political measure, enacted that no one should put on mourning for Sejanus.[86] Tiberius interfered. "He permitted all who wished it to mourn him, forbidding that ANY ONE should be prevented from doing this for ANY ONE ELSE, which [he said] had been repeatedly enacted [meaning, that it was well-settled law]. . . . Afterwards on account of Sejanus, and of those [lawlessly][87] accused, he punished a great many and [also] those charged with having violated and murdered their nearest female relatives."[88]

The property of Sejanus had been confiscated and put into the senatorial treasury, which had been opened by Vitellius, its prefect (Tac. *An.* 5, 8), in support of the rebellion. Justice required its restoration to his relatives. "The effects of Sejanus were taken out of the senatorial treasury, that they might be squeezed into that of Tiberius, on pretext that IT should make restitution."[89]

Not a few of the popular party had committed suicide; perhaps, that they might escape death at the hands of malevolent

---

[83] "Not long afterwards they began to flatter Macro and Laco. They offered them great wealth and honors, to Laco those of questor, to Macro those of pretor, besides allowing the latter to sit among them, clothed in senatorial purple during the votive public games. They [Laco and Macro] declined the offers." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 12.

[84] Concerning Tiberius they voted that "thenceforward he should be called Father of his Country; that his birthday should be honored with ten horse-races and with a senatorial feast. He again [as on more than one previous occasion, **Dio Cass. 58,** 8] forbade any one to introduce such a motion." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 12. What must he have thought of them?

[85] **Dio Cass. 58,** 13. In this connection Dio mentions that Regulus had "always been studious of [pleasing] Tiberius."

[86] "They voted . . . that no one should put on mourning for him [Sejanus], and that a STATUE OF LIBERTY should be erected in the Forum." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 12.

[87] The reading "lawless" is found in two manuscripts.

[88] **Dio Cass. 58,** 16. Compare note 100.

[89] "*Bona Sejani ablata ærario ut in fiscum cogerentur, tanquam referret.*" — **Tacitus,** *An.* **6,** 2. At this act of simple justice Tacitus shows his chagrin. "The Scipios (!) and Silani (!) and Cassii (!) with great asseveration advocated these things in nearly, or quite, identical language." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **6,** 2. Compare note 69, touching the Silani.

opponents; perhaps, that they might under the Roman law save their property for their children.[90] Their confidence in Tiberius was shown by devising their property to him. He, contrary to his custom, assumed the legacies,[91] and effected doubtless, so far as he could, their return to the proper heirs.[92] The same confidence in Tiberius, which these sufferers showed by their wills, was manifested by others in their remarks.[93]

If any doubt could remain that Sejanus and his friends were murdered by conspirators against Tiberius, we shall find in the next section an explicit statement of Caligula to the Senate, that they, after spoiling Sejanus by their flattery, had put him to death; and Seneca also affirms that the Senate were his murderers.[94]

The ambitious Agrippina, who had hoped to put one of her sons in the place of Tiberius, — and perhaps to be practically ruler, — wavered between plans of continuing the struggle and of saving herself.[95] Her senatorial co-conspirators endeavored

---

[90] "Very little property was confiscated of such as anticipated execution by a voluntary death. . . . Nearly all the effects of those who did not die in this manner were confiscated, little or nothing being given to their accusers." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 15, 16. The probability is, that, in murders committed by a conspiracy, no regular prosecution took place, and, therefore, no one could possibly claim a "prosecutor's share." "Not only knights but senators, not only men but women, were crowded into the prison. Some were executed there. Others were thrown from the Capitol by the tribunes and even by the consuls. The bodies of all were tossed into the Forum, and subsequently cast into the river." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 15.

[91] "He accepted everything left to him, and nearly all these [compulsory] suicides left their property to him." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 16.

[92] In the year 33 also, when Sextus Marius, on a fictitious charge probably, had been murdered, Tiberius took possession of his property. The narration of this by Tacitus (*An.* **6,** 19) illustrates his dealings with history. He affirms two things: (1.) That the large property of Marius was taken by Tiberius, which showed that Tiberius had COMPASSED HIS DEATH for the sake of his property; (2.) That Tiberius was so INCENSED AT THE MURDER of Marius and others, that he disburdened his feelings by slaughtering indiscriminately those in prison accused of COMPLICITY WITH SEJANUS. The second statement contradicts the first.

[93] "They attributed nothing or but few things to him [Tiberius], for they said that, as regarded most of these transactions, some he could not have known, and others he had been compelled to do against his will." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 12.

[94] "On the day on which THE SENATE led him out [to execution] the populace pulled him to pieces. . . . Nothing remained of him which the executioner could drag [with his hook]." — **Seneca,** *De Tranquillitate,* **11,** 9. See Caligula's remark in note 114.

[95] "Last of all (Tiberius) having calumniated (?) her with desiring at

to ease their own shoulders by unanimous testimony against her.[96] She was legally amenable to Tiberius, as the adoptive father of her husband, and was by him banished to an island, where, two years subsequently, she died, on the anniversary of her victim's death.[97]

Among the severe trials of Tiberius, in connection with this revolt, was the fate of Livilla, or Livia, *Junior*, his daughter-in-law. Her husband Drusus, and subsequently to his death, her son, had been hoped for by the popular party as their future prince.[98] This made her an object of animosity to the patrician faction. During the rebellion her statues were thrown down and violent decrees enacted against her.[99] She

---

one moment to betake herself to the statue of Augustus, at another to the armies, banished her to [the island of] Pandateria." — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 53. Tacitus, as usual, copies or adds to patrician misstatements. He says: "Persons were provided [by Tiberius] who should warn [Agrippina and her son Nero] to escape to the armies of Germany [at one time commanded by her husband] or in the most public manner to embrace the statue of the divine Augustus in the Forum and call on the people and Senate for aid! And these projects, spurned, were charged as if planned by them." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **4,** 67. Tacitus CONNECTS this with events of A. D. 27. It has no appositeness thereto, and was probably displaced by himself or some earlier writer, for the sake of obscuring history.

[96] Caligula — in response probably to incessant senatorial invective against Sejanus — "inveighed often against all senators, equally, as CLIENTS OF SEJANUS, and *delatores*, prosecutors of his mother and brothers, . . . defending the severe measures of Tiberius as necessary, since credence had to be given to such a multitude of accusers." — **Sueton.** *Calig.* 30. Caligula knew how to use sarcasm.

[97] "Cæsar added, that 'she died on the same day of the year on which Sejanus had been punished [?] two years previously, and that the fact deserved recollection.' . . . It was decreed [by the Senate] that forever on the 18th of October (the day when both had died) an offering should be made to Jupiter." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **6,** 25. The parenthetical remark in its present shape was no part of the decree. The additional remark of Tiberius that Agrippina had not perished by a public execution, is misrepresented by Tacitus as a boast. On the word *punished*, cp. note 73.

[98] When Drusus, her husband, died, the popular party must have endeavored (Tacitus, *An.* **4,** 9) to make his funeral outvie the one previously gotten up by the patricians for Germanicus.

[99] "At Rome, in the beginning of the year [A. D. 32], as if the disgraceful doings (?) of Livia were but lately become known, and had not already [how?] been sufficiently punished, savage decrees were also enacted against her statues and memory." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **6,** 2. The circumstances here mentioned occurred probably in the latter part of 31, while the rebellion held sway. Its location in A. D. 32 may be one of those misplacements by which the patrician party endeavored to obscure

was among the women violated. Circumstantial evidence renders it not improbable that she was also murdered by a reprobate nephew or nephews.[100] When her violators were brought to justice, the senatorial faction called it punishment for adultery.[101]

A conspiracy and state emergency such as we have mentioned would to many a ruler have suggested arbitrary measures. No such charge against Tiberius comes to us even from his enemies. Not a military execution is mentioned; no arbitrary expurgation of the Senate, such as Augustus executed in favor of the reactionary aristocracy. Tiberius seems to have proceeded patiently and persistently in collecting evidence and in laying it before the established tribunal, so that perpetrators of outrage and murder should receive their due reward.

The senatorial faction fought stoutly, and more than three years were needed before Trio could be brought to justice,

---

history. If the decrees were early in the year 32, they must have been an effort of the conspirators, in their fright, to divert indignation from themselves. The enactment of decrees against Livilla's MEMORY implies apparently that she was already dead, which corroborates the supposition that she had been murdered.

[100] Agrippina had, when her husband died, three surviving sons, Nero, Drusus, and Caius or Caligula. The last mentioned resided at first with his great-grandmother, Livia, then with his grandmother, Antonia, and then with his grand-uncle, Tiberius. The other two are represented by their aged relative, the emperor (Tacitus, *An.* **5**, 3; **6**, 2), as addicted to vice. If the action of Tiberius already mentioned (see p. 527), against such as had violated and murdered their nearest female relatives, were without intervention of courts, it must have been against some member, or members, of his family, subject, as such, to his personal jurisdiction. If so, there can be little doubt that the reference is to Nero or Drusus, or to both. Nero was banished (Sueton. *Tib.* 54; compare *Calig.* 15) to the island of Pontia. Drusus (*Ibid.*) was kept prisoner in the Capitol until his death. Compare note 133.

[101] In A. D. 34, Mamercus Scaurus, with whom Seneca (*De Benefic.* **4**, 31, 2, 3) disgusts his readers, and whom **Tacitus** calls "distinguished by noble birth and in pleading causes, but of shameful life," was tried (Tac. *An.* **6**, 29) for "adultery with Livia and magical rites." According to **Dio Cassius, 58**, 24, the sole charge was "having committed adultery with Livia; for many others were punished on her account." The nature of his offence may be judged from the following comment of Tiberius on an insulting and defiant drama by the culprit: "*I will make him an Ajax*" (**Dio Cass. 58**, 24). Ajax is said to have violated Cassandra, the Priestess of Minerva (Smith, *Dict. of Biog.* **1**, p. 88, col. 1), and to have perished in consequence. Defiant language (*Ibid.* p. 87, col. 2) did not save him.

though he had committed some of the murders with his own hand.[102] Even Scaurus escaped conviction for nearly the same length of time.

§ IV. *Social Results of the Rebellion.*

The civil polity of Rome recognized no public prosecutor whose duty it was to proceed against criminals. The popular party had no legislative body elected by itself through whom it could legislate in behalf of justice. The law-making power was largely in the hands of the present criminals, that is, of the Senate, which moreover exercised, to some extent, judicial functions. Had Tiberius under these circumstances treated revolution as calling for extraordinary, even non-legalized action on his part, had he banished, even if he did not execute, the more active criminals, public opinion would have sustained him, and the community would have been spared many evils. He was scrupulous, however, not to overstep his established authority, and the laws were allowed ordinary course.[103] That he did not seize the opportunity for reforming the government may have been due to his advanced age, or to promises exacted by his step-father, or to absence of the originality requisite for political reconstruction, though he was otherwise highly gifted with administrative ability.

Every individual whose relatives had been murdered could bring action against the murderers. These murderers were politically and financially powerful. They brought or instigated counter-prosecutions to intimidate their opponents.[104]

---

[102] See note 90.

[103] Tiberius "sent in to it [the Senate] not only the books [articles of accusation] placed in his hands by 'prosecutors,' but also the evidence under torture superintended by Macro, so that nothing was left to them [the senators] save [acquittal or] condemnation." — **Dio Cass. 58,** 21, compare 24. Tacitus alludes to but one instance of this, which he places in the year 37. Three senators of rank were on trial. "Commentaries [by whom?] sent to the Senate said that Macro had presided at the examination of witnesses, and the torture of the slaves. Absence of any letters from the emperor against them created suspicion." —**Tacitus,** *An.* **6,** 47. In the extract from Dio the bracketed word "acquittal" must not be attributed to him, though necessary to a fair understanding of the matter. In both of these extracts the accusers must have been others than Tiberius. He appears merely as the presiding officer of the Senate, through whom charges and evidence were handed in. Slave evidence in such cases was only valid if taken under torture. Macro's presence at the examination may have been needed to prevent fraud or to mitigate inhumanity.

[104] One man gave as a reason for bringing a prosecution (Tacitus, *An.*

They could, no doubt, hire *Delatores*, prosecutors on shares, who for a price paid, and in hope of half the defendant's property, would undertake the invention of crime and evidence. Seneca depicts the state of matters,[105] and elsewhere places in strong contrast the earlier years of Tiberius.[106]

The proceedings against Gallio illustrate the condition of things. He had moved in the Senate a reward for the pretorian soldiers because of their fidelity against the rebellion. Tiberius, who saw that the motion was a well-intentioned, even if foolish mistake, wrote that the soldiers were under orders of their commander (*Imperatoris*, emperor), and must look to him, not to the Senate, for reward. The Senate, eager to indulge its feeling against Gallio, banished him. Tiberius — against whom the alleged fault had been committed — recalled him and gave him a guard for his protection.[107]

The charges against Cotta Messalinus are another illustration of the prevailing tendency.[108] Their tenor implies that

---

6, 18) that he wished to parry his brother's danger. "Under Tiberius the accusers of others acquired much wealth from their property and from THE SENATORIAL TREASURY, and obtained certain honors." — **Dio Cass. 58**, 14.

[105] "Under Tiberius Cæsar there was *frequens et pœne publica*, a common and almost epidemic insanity for accusation, which, worse than any civil war, brought destruction to Roman citizens. The utterance of the drunken, the *simplicitas*, light-heartedness of the jesting, were seized upon. Nothing was safe." — **Seneca**, *De Benefic.* **3**, 26, 1.

[106] **Seneca** tells Nero on his accession, "No man was ever so dear to another as you to the whole Roman people. . . . No one now mentions the divine Augustus or the earlier years of Tiberius Cæsar." — *De Clementia*, **1**, 1, 5, 6.

This testimony comes from one who had no disposition to overpraise Tiberius. The guarded benevolence of the latter did not suit Seneca's views of conferring favors. (Seneca, *De Benefic.* **2**, 7, 8.) That writer elsewhere (*De Benefic.* **5**, 25, 2) attributes to Tiberius a lack of sociability caused by pride, which was more probably due to practical reasons. Seneca moved in aristocratic society, and could not wholly escape its influence. He tells us (*Epist.* **83**, 13, 14) that Cossus, whom Tiberius on quitting Rome had left in charge of the city, was a thoughtful, discreet man, *virum gravem, moderatum*, especially trusted above other ministers by Tiberius with private matters, and that he never divulged a public or private secret. Yet in connection with this, Seneca tells us that he was an habitual drunkard; a fiction, probably, of the aristocracy.

[107] Tacitus, *An.* **6**, 3; Dio Cass. **58**, 18.

[108] Only three charges are adduced by Tacitus: (1) that Cotta had spoken of Caligula's manhood as yet untried (the Latin admits an indecent perversion); (2) that a birthday feast for Augusta (mother of Tiberius) had by him been called a funeral entertainment; and (3) that in a pecuniary suit with Lepidus and Arruntius, he had said, "The Senate will

they came from the dominant senatorial faction. Tiberius replied, that neither language maliciously perverted, nor the freedom of convivial conversation, ought to be made a ground of accusation. He prefixed to this a statement that it was a torment to know, "what I ought to write you, how I shall phrase it, and what I had better omit," and added that his torments were daily ones.[109]

He felt at times that the earth needed a renovation as with fire.[110] Conscientious anxiety and inability to provide a safeguard against such evils after his death, made him in some moment of perplexity treat Priam as relatively happy in his freedom from kindred anxiety.[111] Financial chaos was by an act of the patricians superadded to other troubles which he needed to remedy,[112] yet he labored on, and the last moments of his earthly existence were apparently devoted to thoughtful provision for the future.[113]

---

protect them, my little Tiberius me." — **Tacitus,** *An.* **6,** 5. For these charges, with which Tacitus seems to sympathize, the senatorial faction had, according to that writer, been on the watch.

[109] Tiberius, as "primate" of the Senate, had to give assent before a prosecution could be LEGALLY commenced. To refuse this for all prosecutions which he disapproved, would practically have made him the exclusive judge of such cases, — an arbitrary power the assumption of which (see Note C, foot-note 10) he probably deemed inappropriate. On the other hand, assent yielded might mean pecuniary ruin, or death, to an innocent man. Even an unguarded word, addressed to the Senate, might be perverted to some one's ruin. The anxiety and suffering of Tiberius in such a position is by Tacitus (*An.* **6,** 6) attributed to his guilty conscience, — a palpable and gross misrepresentation, though frequently accepted as truthful, even at the present day.

[110] "He is said to have often repeated this old [line of Greek poetry]: '*When I am dead, let the earth blaze.*'" — **Dio Cass. 58,** 23. Compare Seneca's views in note 50, on p. 57. The line was probably well known, for Cicero (*De Finibus,* **3,** 19) treats it as familiar, Seneca (*De Clementia,* **2,** 2, 2) quotes it, and Suetonius (*Nero,* 38) mentions its citation in Nero's presence.

[111] **Dio Cassius, 58,** 23. Compare the solicitude of Tiberius in note 39.

[112] The Senate had enacted (Tacitus, *An.* **6,** 17) that by every man two thirds of his moneys at interest should be placed on lands in Italy. Patricians were the chief land-owners, and the object therefore must have been to favor themselves. The enactment necessitated a simultaneous calling in of all loans. This threatened widespread financial ruin, which Tiberius parried (see note 58) by lending a large amount without interest.

[113] "Seneca writes: 'That finding himself dying, he took his signet ring off his finger, and held it awhile, as if he would deliver it to somebody; but put it again upon his finger, and lay for some time, with his left hand clinched, and without stirring; when suddenly summoning his attendants, and no one answering the call, he rose; but his strength

After the death of Tiberius many of the patrician faction who had prosecuted others endeavored to lay their own doings on his shoulders. Caligula became indignant at the attempted falsification, and gave it a public rebuke.[114]

In the foregoing sketch Tiberius has been sometimes called by the accustomed title of emperor, as a means of avoiding the too frequent repetition of his name. This title was, however, repugnant to him. The term "primate" would, in some respects, be better. There is, however, no title at the present day which corresponds exactly to his official position. The appended extract on his personal appearance will not be without interest for some readers.[115]

§ v. *Tacitus falsifies History.*

The *Memoirs* written by Tiberius have unfortunately perished, unless they lie unnoticed in some library. Our chief resources for a knowledge of his reign are three writers, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius.

The last mentioned wrote nearly two centuries after the

---

failing him, he fell down at a short distance from his bed.'" — **Sueton.** *Tib.* 73, Bohn's trans.

[114] Caligula on his accession burned (possibly by advice of Tiberius) the records of testimony against his mother (Dio Cass. **59**, 6; Sueton. *Calig.* 30). The patrician faction may have deemed it a permission to falsify. They complained bitterly on finding that other records were not included. Two years after the death of Tiberius, Caligula "entering the Senate chamber bestowed much praise on him and blame upon the Senate and people (?) for unjust detraction of him [compare his words quoted on p. 208]. . . . Thereupon, enumerating each one of those who had been destroyed, he rendered manifest, as it seemed, that to most of them THE SENATORS were the cause of destruction. Of some they were the accusers; against others they were the witnesses, and on all of them they had passed sentence. These [records] he caused to be read by freedmen from the very documents which he formerly said (?) had been burnt. He added, that . . . you, having puffed up and spoiled Sejanus, put him to death. . . . Saying these things and recapitulating the [senatorial] charges of unbelief [against sundry persons], he ordered them to be engraved on a brazen tablet, and hurried from the Senate chamber." — **Dio Cass. 59**, 16.

[115] "If we may trust the testimony of a noble sitting statue, discovered in modern times at Piperno, the ancient Privernum, near Terracina, and now lodged in the gallery of the Vatican, which has been pronounced to be a genuine representation of Tiberius, we must believe that both in face and figure he was eminently handsome, his body and limbs developed in the most admirable proportions, and his countenance regular, animated, and expressive." — **Merivale,** *Hist. of the Romans*, **4**, pp. 170, 171.

death of Tiberius. He exercised no critical judgment,[116] yet he has in many instances furnished valuable information. Though a senator, he quotes anti-patrician facts and sometimes what seems anti-patrician argument;[117] but his patrician and anti-patrician accounts are too often mixed in utter confusion.

Suetonius wrote without chronological arrangement, and recorded personal anecdotes rather than a connected history. He was often misled by patrician accounts,[118] yet not intentionally, for he narrates at times what must have been very unacceptable to the aristocracy. His easy credence of indecent stories is objectionable.

Tacitus is our most copious source for the history of Tiberius. His arrangement is expressed by the title *Annals*, each year being treated by itself. This aids the reader in studying the sequence of events. He has, however, two main faults. He copies the grossest patrician misrepresentations, not merely in ignorance, but with a knowledge of their untruth. Secondly, he superadds his own discoloration and falsification. A long article, or a work perhaps, would be requisite to treat the subject fully. A few items may suffice to point out his dishonesty.

The unwillingness of Tiberius to call Augustus god was a matter of notoriety.[119] Tacitus, a member, in early life, of the popular party, while friends and acquaintances of Tiberius were yet living, cannot have been ignorant of the fact. Yet, writing in the days of Trajan, when it was less commonly

---

[116] "My purpose is . . . to write connectedly whatever I find stated, . . . without being inquisitive, and without suggesting [to others] whether an act were just or unjust, nor whether the narrative concerning it be false or true." — **Dio Cass. 54**, 15.

[117] "Then another laughable incident took place. [The Senate] voted that he [Tiberius] should select as many of themselves as he wished, and should have twenty of this number (chosen by lot) as guards, armed with swords, whenever he should enter the Senate chamber. For — inasmuch as the outside was guarded by soldiers, and none but senators were permitted to enter — they [thereby] recognized that the guard was given him solely AGAINST THEMSELVES AS HIS ENEMIES." — **Dio Cass. 58**, 17. This was in A. D. 32, shortly after the rebellion. The connection implies that, instead of coming from a writer on the popular side, it was an expression of chagrin by some patrician.

[118] A striking instance of this is that he attributes (Sueton. *Tib.* 61) not merely the murder of Sejanus and others, but the enactment against mourning (see p. 527), to Tiberius.

[119] See Velleius Paterculus, in note 48.

known, he treats his reader to the precious fiction below,[120] and on various occasions puts into the mouth of Tiberius the expression *Divine Augustus*.[121]

Again: Tacitus convicts himself of knowing, that Tiberius, so far from being at enmity with Sejanus, or having murdered him, would not even after his death believe the charges against him. Yet, in the face of this, he fabricates speeches, and puts them into the mouth of Tiberius and others, implying that Sejanus was by Tiberius deemed, and had been treated as, his enemy.[122] By comparing, in a single instance,

---

[120] Claudia Pulchra, a cousin and partisan of Agrippina, and therefore patrician in politics, was prosecuted by Domitius Afer, the greatest pleader whom Quintilian (*Instit.* **12**, 11, 3) had ever heard. For the real charges against her Tacitus probably substitutes (as in some other cases) fictions, and then indulges in the following: "Agrippina, ever vehement, and then in a flame on account of the perilous situation of her kinswoman, flew to Tiberius, and by chance found him sacrificing to the emperor his father. When, availing herself of the circumstance to upbraid him, she told him 'that it was inconsistent in him to offer victims to the deified Augustus and persecute his children: his divine spirit was not transfused into dumb statues: the genuine images of Augustus were the living descendants from his celestial blood: she herself was one; one sensible of impending danger, and now in the mournful state of a suppliant. In vain was Pulchra set up as the object of attack; when the only cause of her overthrow was her affection for Agrippina foolishly carried even to adoration.'" — **Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 52, Bohn's trans.

[121] Tacitus, *An.* **1**, 11; **2**, 38; **3**, 54, 56. The same expression is, in the *Annals*, **3**, 34, put into the mouth of Drusus, son of Tiberius. The statement of **Tacitus** (*An.* **4**, 57) that Tiberius visited Campania for the professed purpose "of dedicating a temple to Jupiter at Capua and one to Augustus at Nola," is probably a mere falsehood.

[122] Under the year 35, Tacitus says, that "although three years had elapsed since the death of Sejanus, yet time, prayers, and satiety, which are wont to mollify others, did not so mollify Tiberius, but that he punished uncertain or obsolete [actions] as if weighty and recent. Under fear of this Fulcinius Trio [consul when Sejanus was murdered, and one of the chief plotters against him and Tiberius], not enduring the accusers who were pressing him hard, put together, in his 'last tablets,' many savage accusations against Macro and the chief freedmen of Cæsar; objecting to [Cæsar] himself a mind weakened by age, and [treating] his absence as exile. Which tablets, concealed by the heirs, Tiberius ordered to be recited, [because] ostentatious of his enduring liberty [of speech] in others and indifferent to his own infamy, or [because] HAVING BEEN LONG IGNORANT AS TO THE CRIMES OF SEJANUS, he preferred eventually, that in any manner whatever, the statements [which brought them to light?] should be made commonly known." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **6**, 38.

The concluding reason shows Tacitus to have been aware, that, for three or four years after the death of Sejanus, any crimes attributed to that individual had remained discredited by Tiberius. The remarks,

the account of Tacitus with that of Dio Cassius, a more definite opinion can be attained as to the manner in which the former adds to his authorities.[123]

The foregoing are but individual instances of misrepresentation. Its frequency and extent may be inferred from the fact that a reader might peruse Tacitus, and that readers generally, if not universally, HAVE perused him, without consciousness of attempted patrician rebellions in A. D. 14 and 19, and without knowledge that such a rebellion had broken ferociously out in A. D. 31. What would be thought concerning a modern historian of Germany in 1848, or of the United States in 1860 – 1865, who should persistently ignore, in the former country, a popular uprising, or, in the latter, an effort of the slaveholders to dismember the government. His effort would, because of present facilities for preserving information, be abortive, but not, certainly, more untruthful in object, than

---

therefore, which Tacitus at an earlier date puts into the mouth of Tiberius and others, as also his own insinuations (*An.* **5**, 6, 7; **6**, 3, 8, 14, 19, 22, 25, 30) IMPLYING hostility of the emperor to Sejanus, were by Tacitus himself KNOWN to be fictions for the furtherance of falsehood. The beginning of the foregoing extract admits no plausible interpretation save on the supposition that Tacitus knew Trio to have been PROSECUTED WITH THE APPROVAL OF TIBERIUS, FOR COMPLICITY IN THE MURDER OF SEJANUS AND HIS FRIENDS. The unscrupulous patricianism of Tacitus is evinced by his treating an atrocious, wholesale murder as having become obsolete in three years. The light which the foregoing throws on the untruthfulness of Tacitus is not affected by the obvious absurdity of supposing that "tablets" which, according to both himself and Dio Cassius, were silent about Sejanus, should have been recited in order to throw odium on him.

[123] Dio Cassius copies a patrician authority in which the term *Republic* has been obviously substituted for *Senate*, — the two ideas being identical in some patrician minds, — and in which the exile of Gallio is incorrectly attributed to Tiberius.

Tiberius banished Junius Gallio, "who had proposed, that a seat in the theatre among the knights should be given to soldiers after serving their time, — charging that he was apparently inciting them to favor the Republic [the Senate] rather than himself." — **Dio Cass. 58, 18.** Cp. p. 532.

"Junius Gallio, who had proposed 'that the pretorian soldiers, having fulfilled their term of service, should thence acquire the privilege of sitting in the fourteen rows of the theatre allotted to the Roman knights,' he rebuked vehemently, and, as if present, demanded 'what business he had with the soldiers, whose duty bound them to observe only the orders of the emperor [*Imperatoris*, commander], and from the emperor alone to receive their rewards. Had he forsooth discovered what had escaped the sagacity of the divine Augustus? Or was it not rather a method INVENTED BY A SATELLITE OF SEJANUS, to raise sedition and discord? an artifice by which, under pretence of conferring honor, he might stimulate the simple minds of the soldiers to break through the established regulations of the service.'" — **Tacitus,** *An.* **6**, 3, Bohn's trans. altered.

that of Tacitus. The portion of his *Annals* which mentions the execution of Sejanus is, indeed, lost, but his extant treatment of the attendant circumstances leaves no doubt of elaborated imposition.

The dealing of Tacitus with Livilla and Agrippina may illustrate his treatment of the conspiracy. Livilla was connected with the popular party and was in friendship with Tiberius. Agrippina was prominent in patrician movements and at enmity with him. The rebellious patricians who murdered the former, endeavored, in her case as in that of Sejanus, to mitigate their own crimes by blackening the character of their victim.[124] Tacitus, to throw his readers off their guard, states under the year 23, when no motive for falsification appears, that she was seduced by Sejanus whom she aided to poison her husband, but that nothing was known of it until eight years later.[125] Eight years later, lest the reader might

---

[124] The earliest charge by the conspirators against Livilla was probably one preserved by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* **29**, 8, 5) of improper intimacy, not with Sejanus, but with Eudemus, her physician.

[125] We are told by **Tacitus** (*An.* **4**, 3), Sejanus "enticed her by adultery and . . . impelled her to the murder of her husband"; and again (**4**, 8), "Sejanus . . . chose a poison which, creeping [only] by degrees into the system, should resemble an accidental disease. It was given to Drusus [her husband] by Lygdus the eunuch, as became known eight years afterwards"; and again (**3**, 11), "The method of [effecting] this crime [that is, the sole evidence of its existence] divulged [eight years afterwards] by Apicata, wife of Sejanus, was *patefactus* substantiated by putting Eudemus [the physician of Livilla] and Lygdus to the torture." The extant works of Tacitus do not contain this alleged revelation by Apicata, but it has been transmitted us by **Dio Cassius** (**58**, 11): "Apicata . . . having learned that the children were dead, and having seen their bodies on the [malefactors'] stairs, went away and having written in a book concerning the death of Drusus many things against his wife Livilla, — on whose account (?) she had quarrelled with her husband so as no longer to live with him, — she sent it to Tiberius, and then committed suicide."

According to this story, Apicata — at variance with her husband and conscious of his crime — refrained during eight years from mentioning it. Then, when he had been murdered, she looked at the lifeless forms of her children, and — after viewing the innocent little daughter who had been outraged and strangled — wrote to Tiberius, not to complain of the murderers, but to palliate their crimes by narrating events eight years old. If the hard-pushed conspirators professed during the lifetime of Tiberius any information from Apicata, we may be sure that it did not, until after his death, assume the form of a letter to himself. If they had tortured to death Eudemus and Lygdus, they would deem it safe to fabricate evidence in their name.

Tacitus diverts scrutiny from his narrative by mixing with it extrane-

notice that the charge originated with political enemies who had murdered her, he treats it as, since a long time, well known.[126]

In the case of Agrippina, Tacitus quotes some charges which, as narrated in his pages, do not bring to light, and scarcely even suggest, any political criminality.[127] To these he adds an aspersion of her private character, fabricated probably by himself, with the object of refuting it and of thus placing her in the light of a vindicated woman.[128] The charge of prompting conspiracy and instigating murder is wholly overlooked.

Whenever Tacitus becomes pious, or undertakes to philosophize or moralize, to expatiate on jurisprudence or antiquities, or to address our sympathies, the reader should be doubly watchful against effort to conceal some patrician roguery or else some patrician defeat. Pious indignation against Tiberius for not consulting the Sibylline Oracles, is but a means to divert attention from the position of reactionaries afraid of their former hobby.[129] Egyptian antiquities are a screen to plottings of rebellion by Germanicus in Egypt.[130] An account of usury legislation throws somewhat into the shade a

---

ous matters, and endeavors to inspire credence by putting it forward as a defence of Tiberius against the charge of poisoning his son, even while stating that no writer had ever made such a charge. It winds up as follows: "Nor has any writer appeared so hostile as to charge it upon Tiberius; though in other instances they have sedulously collected and aggravated every action of his. My purpose in relating and refuting this rumor was, under so glaring an example, to destroy the credit of groundless hearsays, and to request of those into whose hands my present undertaking shall come, that they would not prefer vague and improbable rumors, unscrupulously credited, to the narrations of truth unadulterated with romance." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 11, Bohn's trans. altered. Should any one wish model impudence in a party renegade, let him read Tacitus.

[126] Tacitus, *An.* **6**, 2, quoted in note 99.

[127] Tacitus, *An.* **4**, 67, quoted in note 95.

[128] Tacitus (*An.* **6**, 25) quotes Tiberius as accusing Agrippina of adultery with Asinius Gallus. Had he attributed to him a charge against her of adultery with the man in the moon, the certainty could hardly be greater of his knowing that no such utterance had proceeded from Tiberius or from any cotemporary source. Gallus, a friend of Tiberius, was a leader of the popular party. As such his life (see note 68) was in danger from the animosity of Agrippina's adherents. The absurd quotation cannot have been invented before the time of Tacitus, and not improbably originated with himself.

[129] See Ch. VII. note 103.

[130] Cp. pp. 186, 187, with Tac. *An.* **2**, 60, 61.

senatorial enactment whose purpose was to make the borrowing of money easy for senators and difficult for others.[131] Meditations on Astrology and Fate suggest — what Tacitus shrunk probably from asserting — that Drusus, the worthless son of Germanicus, suffered, not for his crimes, but owing to blind fate, or because the gods take no interest in man.[132] With the same object, in the sections immediately consequent on the foregoing, Tacitus appeals to sympathy in behalf of Drusus, because those in charge of him "took note of his countenance, groans, and secret repinings," which means — if we may judge from information in the same paragraph — that they had to bear with the violence and imprecations of their prisoner. Tacitus evidently wishes his readers to infer, what he has been guarded enough to avoid affirming, that Drusus died of starvation.[133]

The disposition of Tacitus to veil or suppress mention of crime committed, or ridicule incurred, by the patrician party is, naturally enough, conjoined to misrepresentation of such popular leaders as were most hated by patricians. No peculiarity of his work is more obvious or offensive than this. If Tiberius rejects honors, the historian, instead of appreciating the fact, subjoins a remark to pervert the reader's understanding of it.[134] If Gallus and Gallio are each furnished with a military guard, this is represented, not in its true light as a friendly effort to protect them, but as a device of Tiberius for their annoyance.[135] A glaring instance of the same tendency

---

[131] See note 112.

[132] Tac. *An.* **6**, 21, 22.

[133] **Tacitus**, *An.* **6**, 23, 24. The charge against Drusus, — attributed in this last section to Tiberius, — of "a disposition *exitiabilem in suos* destructive towards his own relatives," claims careful consideration as to whether it means, that he had murdered his aunt, Livilla. Compare note 100. A reader unfamiliar with Roman history should guard against confusing this Drusus with Livilla's husband, the son of Tiberius.

[134] "Neither however would he, on account of these acts, accept the name of 'Father of his Country,' a title offered him before; nay, he sharply rebuked such as said, 'His divine occupations,' and called him 'Lord.' Hence it was DIFFICULT AND DANGEROUS to speak under a prince who dreaded liberty and abhorred flattery." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **2**, 87, Bohn's trans. The dread of liberty is flatly contradicted by statements (forced out of Tacitus?) in the *Annals*, **4**, 6, quoted in note 5.

[135] The seizure of Gallus has been mentioned in note 68. The guard and encouragement given him by Tiberius were subsequently misrepresented by the patrician party (Dio Cass. **58**, 3) as contrivances for his annoyance, that his life and uneasiness might be prolonged instead of ended by suicide. The year 30 is lost from the *Annals* of Tacitus, and

occurs in his dealing with Domitian. The latter (perhaps to end needless war in Britain) had recalled Agricola. When, at a later date, Agricola was ill, Domitian made kindly inquiries concerning him, and, on the last day, sent repeatedly to inform himself. The contemptible comments of Tacitus are given below.[136] He had himself received kindness from Domitian and was nevertheless willing to please his new associates, the aristocracy, by attributing to crime in Domitian what was evidently a courtesy, if not an office of friendship. Yet this is the man who tells his readers their need of aid to understand history, and who puts himself forward as its interpreter.[137]

In the revival of learning an overestimate of long-neglected heathen authors was natural. That Tacitus should, however, until the present day, have retained reputation as a reliable historian, is no credit to modern research.

---

with it is lost any account of Gallus being seized. But the spirit of the lost narrative can be safely judged from the present portion which narrates the death of Gallus. "The death of Asinius Gallus became generally known. That he perished through famine, was undoubted; but whether of his own accord or by constraint, was held uncertain. The emperor was consulted, 'whether he would suffer (?) him to be buried,' when he blushed not to grant it as a favor." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **6**, 23, Bohn's trans.

The guard for Gallio (compare note 68) is thus noticed: "As it was alleged that he would experience no hardship from an exile at Lesbos, a celebrated and charming island, which he had selected, he was hauled back to Rome, and kept under guard in the house of a magistrate." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **6**, 3, Bohn's trans.

[136] "Commiseration was aggravated by a prevailing report that he [Agricola] was taken off by poison. I cannot venture to affirm anything certain of this matter; yet, during the whole course of his illness, the principal of the imperial freedmen and the most confidential of the physicians was sent much more frequently than was customary with a court whose visits were chiefly paid by messages; whether that was done out of real solicitude, or for the purposes of state inquisition, on the day of his decease it is certain that accounts of his approaching dissolution were every instant transmitted to the emperor by couriers stationed for the purpose; and no one believed that the information, which so much pains was taken to accelerate, could be received with regret." — **Tacitus**, *Agric.* 43, Bohn's trans.

[137] "It was pertinent to search out and narrate these things, since few by their own wisdom can discern honorable things from the more degrading, useful things from injurious. The majority are taught by the fortunes of others." — **Tacitus**, *An.* **4**, 33.

NOTE H.

EGYPTIAN WORSHIP AT ROME.

The Egyptian worship, equally with the Greek and Roman, appears to have been destitute of, and disconnected from, any teaching of its era, whether moral or intellectual. It consisted, as did the other two, merely of rites and ceremonies. From the intelligent and moral it can have had neither affection nor respect, to which, in fact, it made no claim. Its votaries at Rome can never have been many.

Senatorial partisans from an early date showed hostility to Egyptian rites, and, in times of patrician triumph, suppressed them.[1] These rites were not under senatorial management, and patricians had no wish to tolerate what they did not control. The popular party deemed senatorial management of such matters uncalled for. Hence, in periods of popular victory, we find the Egyptian religion legalized.[2] How far this was due to mere party feeling and how far to enlarged conceptions of human rights would be difficult to determine.

---

[1] "When the Senate (in B. C. 219) had decreed that the fanes of Isis and Serapis should be destroyed, and no one of the workmen ventured to touch it, L. Æmilius Paullus, the consul, laying aside his garment, seized an axe and cut into its doors." — **Valer. Max. 1**, 3, 3. Party feeling ran high at this time. The workmen may have been influenced by sympathy with or fear of the popular party.

In B. C. 54, "the Senate decreed destruction to their temples [those of Serapis and Isis] which some had individually (?) erected." — **Dio Cass. 40**, 47. In B. C. 48, "at the close of the year, among other prodigies, a swarm of bees settled in the Capitol near the statue of Hercules, and the [public] soothsayers decreed, as the rites of Isis were then taking place, that her sacred structures, and those of Serapis, should be destroyed." — **Dio Cass. 42**, 26.

In B. C. 21, during patrician ascendency, the senatorial leader, Agrippa, "banished Egyptian rites, which had again invaded the city, forbidding any one, even in a suburb, to perform them within a mile [of the city]." — **Dio Cass. 54**, 6. They were (see p. 188 n.) again suppressed in A. D. 19, when the Senate was preparing for rebellion against Tiberius.

[2] In B. C. 58, the year (see p. 149) of popular triumph over Cicero, the Egyptian worship was legalized, as we learn from the following address to the Romans: "What! did you not [from and] after the consulship of Piso and Gabinius place in the number of your gods the Egyptian divinities named Serapis and Isis?" — **Arnobius**, *Adv. Gent.* **2**, 73.

In B. C. 43, the year subsequent to Cæsar's assassination, the Triumvirs "voted a temple [each] to Serapis and Isis." — **Dio Cass. 47**, 15.

About the close of the first century, Tacitus, a reactionary conservative, first holds it up to his countrymen as an object for their wonder, and during the next century we find the gods of Egypt regularly installed at Rome.[3] This installation must have come from the conservative heathens who had been in power.

The cause of this change in the senatorial reactionaries is a simple one. They originally thought themselves powerful enough to control matters, and wished no ceremonies which had been introduced by others than their own party. But at the close of the first century, and still more during the second, heathenism was visibly going down before monotheism. Its hard-pushed advocates were but too thankful therefore to club forces. The Egyptian religion — setting aside its deification of the lower animals, which does not seem to have been transplanted into Italy — stood, an opponent of monotheism, essentially on the same ground as the Roman one. It consisted of rites, ceremonies, and omens, recognized images as properly representing divine beings, and regarded these beings as devoid of moral object in, we cannot say governing the world, but in their occasional attention to some of its concerns. The Roman religion could not be advocated without making ground on which the Egyptian could stand. In the time of Dio Cassius, at the close of the second century and the beginning of the third, this was likely to have been already so forced upon heathen attention that it could not be ignored. Under this conviction he probably writes when he treats the suppression of Egyptian rites by Roman authorities as a marvel.[4]

An incident — pressed into service by advocates of heathenism, who felt the need of changing front on the Egyptian question — affords evidence that in A. D. 70, Christianity

---

[3] **Tertullian** tells the Latins, "You have reconstructed altars to the ROMAN Serapis." — *Apol.* 6. Commodus "changed his lodgings, denying that he could sleep in the Palatium, [because] . . . the marble image of Anubis was seen to change its place." — **Lampridius**, *Commodus*, 16; *Script. Hist. August*, p. 91.

[4] Under B. C. 53 or 52, Dio Cassius narrates bloody rain (cp. page 124 n.) perspiration of a statue, which means probably condensation of atmospheric moisture on the stone or metal, an owl appearing in the city, a meteor, and other prodigies. He then superadds: "To me the decree also in the preceding year [B. C. 54], near its close, concerning Serapis and Isis [compare note 1], appears to have been no less of a prodigy." — **Dio Cass. 40**, 47. By a prodigy he means, probably, the precursor of ill fortune.

was attracting attention at Alexandria. While Vespasian was in that city before proceeding to assume imperial power at Rome, he was persuaded into a fictitious imitation of some miracles recorded in our Gospels. Vespasian's character was, in the main, honest. His objections to the proposed performance may have been repugnance towards fraud. If so, however, he must, like some other honest men when reasoning with rogues, have used arguments which he deemed more intelligible to them than moral ones.[5] His subsequent treatment of the Alexandrines indicates chagrin or indignation, rather than satisfaction.[6] There is no evidence that he or his children ever alluded to the miracles afterwards. Both he and they were dead before any extant record of them was made.

Of the miracles attributed to Vespasian both may, and one

---

[5] Vespasian was of humble origin, and for that reason was not, when Nero perished, prominent as an aspirant for the imperial power. Suetonius says of him, while at Alexandria: "Authority, and as it were a certain dignity, was lacking to a prince whom no one had anticipated, and who was just entering on office. This [dignity] also was added. A blind man from the lower class, and one who had a lame leg, approached him, as he sat before the tribunal, praying him to cure them. [They alleged that] it had been shown them during sleep (or 'during the night,' *per quietem*), BY SERAPIS, that he could restore the eyes by spitting on them, and make the leg sound if he would deign to touch it with his heel."—**Sueton.** *Vespas.* 7. The cure of the blind man is copied from Mark **8**, 23. The lame leg was, according to Tacitus and Dio Cassius, a lame hand. As we follow one author or the other, we might select one miracle (Mark **2**, 11, 12; Matt. **9**, 6) or a different one (Mark **3**, 5; Matt. **12**, 13; Luke **6**, 10) in the Gospels as the original which prompted it. Neither cure can have been suggested by anything in mythology, to which, in fact, benevolent miracles seem to have been unknown. Both Tacitus and Suetonius represent Vespasian as reluctant to play his part. Persuasion—of physicians according to the former, of friends according to the latter—overcame his reluctance; their final argument, according to **Tacitus** (*Hist.* **4**, 81), being that "the glory of a cure [if] performed would belong to Cæsar, the ridicule of a failure would attach to the afflicted [on whose assertion it was attempted]." Persuasion of this kind would not have been used in answer to MORAL objections.

[6] "He renewed many taxes, some of them long disused, and increased existing ones. . . . Therefore the Alexandrines reproached him ON OTHER ACCOUNTS, and 'because you exact six *oboli* additionally,' so that Vespasian, though a very mild man, got angry and commanded the six *oboli* per man to be collected and took counsel about punishing them, . . . but, on Titus petitioning for them, Vespasian forgave them. They however did not desist, but shouted loudly, in some public assembly, to Titus, saying, 'we excuse him, for he did not know how to act the emperor.'"—**Dio Cass. 66**, 8.

perhaps must, have been suggested by Mark's gospel.[7] If so, it corroborates the tradition that this gospel was published in Alexandria.[8] The publication must have been three or four years previous to Vespasian's arrival there.

Gibbon suspects the Flavian family of introducing Egyptian worship at Rome.[9] For this there is no sufficient ground. Vespasian in one instance while at Alexandria visited the temple of Serapis,[10] from political motives or from easy good-nature. Titus, from motives of policy, did a somewhat similar action.[11] Vespasian sympathized so little with the aristocracy that he would scarcely have troubled himself to suppress Egyptian or Jewish rites. Any LEGAL re-establishment by the conservatives of the Egyptian religion at Rome took place more probably under Marcus Antoninus[12] (Athenag. *Supplicat.* § 1) when the Senate were likely to favor it.

NOTE I.

JEWISH REVOLT UNDER NERO.

§ 1. *Outline of its Course.*

THE commotions which preceded this revolt began as early, certainly, as the autumn of A. D. 64, shortly after the fire at Rome,[1] and the revolt itself began at Cæsarea in the spring

---

[7] Compare note 5.

[8] According to Eusebius (*Ecc. Hist.* **6**, 14) Peter's teaching at Rome was written down by Mark, who subsequently (Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* **1**, 16; Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.* 8) carried his manuscript to Alexandria and published it there, deeming it perhaps a safer place than Rome for its publication.

[9] Gibbon, *Roman Empire*, ch. 2, note 16.

[10] This is placed by Tacitus (*Hist.* **4**, 82) after, and by Suetonius (*Vespas.* 7) before the miracles.

[11] See Ch. X. note 5.

[12] "Such was the terror caused by the Marcomannian war, that Antoninus summoned priests from every direction, fulfilled FOREIGN RITES, [and] purified Rome after every [heathen religious] fashion." — **Capitolinus**, *Marc. Antoninus*, 13; *Script. Hist. August.* p. 48.

[1] See pp. 243, 244. **Sulpicius Severus**, also, a writer at the close of the fourth century, after narrating the deaths of Paul and Peter, adds: "DURING these events at Rome the Jews . . . COMMENCED to rebel."

of 65,[2] on the occasion of the city government being transferred from Jews to heathens.[3] The sarcastic jest of a heathen gave some impulse to it.[4] The Jewish aristocracy, as a

---

—*Hist. Sac.* Book **2**, 29 ; De la Bigne, *Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum*, Vol. **7**, col. 269 B. The persecution of Christians at Rome was in the winter of 64 – 65.

[2] **Josephus** says: "The war commenced in the second year of the procuratorship of Florus, and the TWELFTH of Nero's reign."—*Antiq.* **20**, 11, 1. And again: "The war began in the twelfth year of Nero's reign, and the seventeenth of Agrippa's, in the month of Artemisius."—*Wars*, **2**, 14, 4. Nero's twelfth year was the calendar year A. D. 65, for the second year of an emperor began always on the first day of January after his accession, a rule different from that adopted in counting our years of Independence. The month of Artemisius corresponded with March or April or partly with each. See note 34. Agrippa's seventeenth year cannot have been later than A. D. 65.

[3] If we take in order the narrative of Josephus it supplies the following information. Prior to the Passover in the spring of A. D. 65, Cestius Gallus, Prefect of Syria, — to whom the Procurator, Florus, stood in the relation of a subordinate, — came to Jerusalem. (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 14, 3.) The circumstances of the times justify the supposition that he deemed the journey requisite to guard against an outbreak. After what would seem to have been a brief stay he returned to Antioch, being accompanied to Cæsarea by Florus, who probably visited Jerusalem on the same errand, and then returned to his usual residence. "At this date," says **Josephus**, "the Greeks [that is, the heathens] of Cæsarea being victorious [over the Jews] in obtaining from Nero the government of the city, brought his written decision, *τὰ τῆς κρίσεως γράμματα*, and the war began. . . . But the pretext for it was not proportionate to the evils which resulted from it. For the Jews in Cæsarea, having a synagogue beyond a piece of ground whose owner was a Cæsarean Greek, made repeated and earnest efforts to buy his ground, offering a price many times its worth. And when he, neglecting their request, commenced as an added insult to build on the ground, erecting workshops, and left them but a narrow, and in every respect contracted access, the more impulsive of the young men, rushing thither, at first hindered his building ; but as Florus restrained these from violence, the leading Jews, in their perplexity, with the assistance of John, the tax-gatherer, persuaded Florus with eight silver talents to stop the work. But he, promising to do all things for the sake (?) of getting the money, after he had received it, went from Cæsarea to Sebaste and left the insurrection [to act] on its own authority, as if (?) he had sold to the Jews an impunity to fight it out."—**Josephus**, *Wars*, **2**, 14, 4. Probably money was placed at the disposal of Florus, in hopes that he could buy what was refused to the Jews. The rebellion may have called him to Sebaste.

[4] A word of explanation will make the narrative intelligible. In Leviticus **14**, verses 4, 5, we are told that a leper was to be purified with two birds, one of which was to be sacrificed in an earthen vessel. Further, the heathens opposed to the Jewish account of their miraculous deliverance from Egypt, a story that they were expelled by the Egyptians because of a cutaneous affection. (Josephus, *Against Apion*, **1**, 25, 26;

body, and no small portion of the quieter citizens, opposed it. Florus gave the conservatives at Jerusalem such military aid as they asked,[5] and subsequently, in their interest and in full understanding with the chief of them, Cestius Gallus, governor of Syria, marched a Roman legion, in the autumn of 65, against Jerusalem.[6] The men of this legion had been recruited in Syria, where Jewish influence was strong, and had possibly no great inclination for their work, from which they ran away.[7]

2, 2; Tacitus, *Hist.* **5**, 4.) The day after the trouble mentioned in the preceding note was the Sabbath, and when the Jews were assembled in the synagogue, some mischievous wag of a heathen, wishing perhaps to insinuate that they were a scaly set, and that a purification was called for after their expulsion from the city government, inverted an earthen vessel at the entrance of the synagogue and sacrificed birds. The consequence was a fight between the more excitable Jews and such of the Cæsareans as defended the sacrificer. Jucundus, the Roman master of horse, who had been appointed to keep order, appeared on the ground, took away the earthen vessel, and endeavored to stop the commotion. No allusion is made by Josephus to loss of life or personal injury sustained by the Jews, but he says that, on Jucundus being overcome by the violence of the Cæsareans, the Jews seizing their Laws [books of the Law] departed to Narbata, seven or eight miles distant. (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 14, 5.)

As the quieter part of the Jews objected to the fight, and as a large number of that nation were massacred at Cæsarea some months later, we must probably understand that a portion only, to wit the revolutionary dispositioned, had left the city. It is of course impossible that the whole Jewish population, including women and children, could at an hour's notice remove elsewhere. As Florus reproached their envoys for carrying off the Laws [books of the Law], it is probable that the conservative Jews of Cæsarea, equally as of Jerusalem, were in communication with him, and that the complaint was made at their instance. THEY could feel aggrieved that the revolutionists, by appropriating to themselves the Books of the Law, should assume the appearance of being the true representatives of the Cæsarean Jews, whereas Florus, aside from a desire of supporting the conservatives, could have had no interest in their Books.

[5] Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 15, 6.

[6] Agrippa accompanied Cestius (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 18, 9), and "many of the principal citizens . . . invited Cestius [to enter] with the understanding that they should open the gates."—**Josephus**, *Wars*, **2**, 19, 7. They had, at an earlier date (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 17, 4) asked Florus and Agrippa to intervene with force. In the Life of Josephus, where the presence of Cestius in this attack is ignored, that writer represents himself (§ 5) and others, as "hoping that before long Gessius [Florus], coming with a large force, would stop the revolution."

[7] **Josephus**, *Wars*, **2**, 19, 9. The date of this defeat is, in the same passage, stated to have been "the eighth day of the month of *Dius* [see note 34] in the TWELFTH year of Nero's reign." The twelfth legion which suffered this defeat was, subsequently to the war, punished by

After this failure, the conservatives seem to have been thrown for a year on their own resources, or, which is more probable, to have obtained from the Roman government permission to put down the revolt in their own way. Compare note 31. Their authority must, to some extent, have been substituted for that of Florus as less offensive to the Jews. Agrippa is mentioned (Josephus, *Life*, 11) as displacing a governor of Cæsarea and substituting another. A committee of three was sent from Jerusalem to the conservatives of Galilee. Josephus was at this time acting with the conservatives, and was a member of this committee.[8] The revolutionists, before many months, bought him over by offering him command of their forces in Galilee. In his *Wars* he carefully suppresses this conservative effort on his part, and gives the impression that, immediately after the retreat of the Romans, he took command of revolutionary forces.

The change of sides by Josephus must have been in the spring or summer of A. D. 66.[9] After this change he superintended for some months a guerilla warfare, during which his followers twice attacked, and were repulsed from Sepphoris, Josephus being among the first to run away.[10] Gessius Florus, during this time, seems to have retained his authority, but to have forborne active hostilities.[11] His murder took place probably in the autumn of 66, or in the following winter.[12] The only men to whom it can with plausibility be attributed are some of those acting under Josephus. The total silence

---

Titus, who sent them (Josephus, *Wars*, **7**, 1, 3) from their comfortable quarters in Syria to the confines of Armenia and Cappadocia. It deserves note, that Josephus in his *Life* (§§ 5 – 7) totally ignores Cestius as commander, and speaks merely of Florus as attacking Jerusalem with his own forces.

[8] "Gessius having been defeated, the principal men of Jerusalem . . . sent me and two other priests to persuade the evil-disposed [in Galilee] to lay down their arms." — **Josephus**, *Life*, 7. Sepphoris, the chief city of Galilee, throughout the war remained stoutly conservative.

[9] Cultivation of the ground seems to have been going on when Josephus assumed command. See his *Wars*, **2**, 20, 8; and compare **2**, 21, 2.

[10] Josephus, *Life*, 15, 67.

[11] Florus held hostages from some Jewish cities. These resided at Dora (Josephus, *Life*, 8), a seaport nine miles northward from Cæsarea. He received a visit from Agrippa and Berenice (Josephus, *Life*, 11) at Berytus, a place in Syria north of Sidon. The locality renders probable that Cestius Gallus had arranged a meeting with them there.

[12] The statement of Suetonius (*Vespas.* 4), that Florus was murdered, has already been quoted; see Ch. VIII. note 184.

of that writer touching the fate of Florus strengthens the suspicion that he had personal motives for ignoring it.

Vespasian was now sent by Nero to put down the insurrection. He arrived early in 67. The predatory bands under Josephus dispersed without seeing the enemy, or attempting opposition,[13] and their leader escaped to Jotapata, a fortified place farther north. Thereupon, if we believe Josephus, Vespasian, after four days spent in making a road, marched to Jotapata,[14] which was taken in forty-seven days.[15] The tedious nature of siege operations in that age used up two, or part of two, consecutive summers, those, namely, of 67 and 68, in the capture of various little strongholds outside of Jerusalem.[16] Then the death of Nero, early in June, 68, opened the imperial throne to rival contestants and diverted Vespasian's attention from the war, which was not resumed until A. D. 70, when he was secure of imperial power. Titus then attacked and took Jerusalem. The siege began in the spring and ended in the summer.[17]

§ II. *Causes of the Revolt.*

Josephus gives two essentially different reasons for the revolt. One is oppression by Florus. The incorrectness of this will be examined in the next section. His other allega-

---

[13] Josephus, *Wars*, **3**, 6, 3.

[14] Vespasian reached Jotapata on "the twenty-first of the month Artemisius," (**Josephus**, *Wars*, **3**, 7, 3), that is, in April.

[15] Josephus, *Wars*, **3**, 7, 33. This capture is affirmed by **Josephus**, (*Wars*, **3**, 7, 36) to have taken place on the first of the month Panemus, which would be some time in May. He adds that it was in "the thirteenth year of Nero." This may be a transcriber's error, or an intentional falsehood by Josephus, for the purpose of concealing the time — unaccounted for in the *Wars* — during which he acted as a conservative. The capture cannot have been before A. D. 67, which was Nero's fourteenth year. Nero's visit to Greece began in the latter part of 66, and as he was already there (Josephus, *Wars*, **3**, 1, 3) when he sent Vespasian to take command, it is impossible that the latter could in the SPRING of 66 have reached his destination. At that date he had not even started. Compare note 44 and the prefixed text. The capture may have been in 68.

[16] "Within two summers, he [Vespasian] held, with a victorious army, all the camps and all the cities except Jerusalem." — **Tacitus**, *Hist.* **5**, 10. With this, the detailed narrative of Josephus agrees.

[17] The Romans encamped before the city on the fourteenth of Xanthicus (Josephus, *Wars*, **5**, 13, 7) and took it on the eighth of Gorpiæus (Josephus, *Wars*, **6**, 10, 1), months which correspond nearly with March and August.

tion is, that the Jews were prospering, and that their insurrection was owing to a Messianic excitement.[18] The latter of these two reasons is assigned also by two heathen authors,[19] and accords best with the fact that simultaneous disturbances broke out in adjacent countries.[20] A Messianic excitement, accompanied as usual by anti-Roman feeling, was doubtless a potent agency among the more conscientious revolutionists. Aside from these, was a mixed class of unprincipled men and of those who mistook their excitability for religious zeal, or their love of authority for patriotism. The insurrection fell at an early day into the hands of this mixed class.[21] If conscientious persons in Judæa retained their connection with it after the preliminary disturbances, and into the period of violence, they must have been of the least intelligent kind, or

---

[18] "What especially excited them [the revolutionary Jews] to the war was an ambiguous oracle . . . found in the sacred writings, that '*at that time some one from their country should rule the world.*' This they understood as οἰκεῖον, pertaining to their own people, and many discreet persons were deceived as to its interpretation. The oracle pointed out the rule of Vespasian, he having been declared emperor while in Judæa." — **Josephus**, *Wars*, **6**, 5, 4. An earlier statement harmonizes with this. "Eleazar, son of Ananias, the high-priest, a bold youth, in command of the temple, persuaded those who ministered in its service to receive no gift or sacrifice from any one who was not a Jew. This was the beginning of the war against the Romans." — **Josephus**, *Wars*, **2**, 17, 2. The last statement may mean that prior disturbances could be explained as aimed only against the LOCAL authorities. Tribute to the Romans had, however (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 16, 5), been previously refused. The conservatives endeavored fruitlessly (*Wars*, **2**, 17, 3, 4) to stem this last innovation.

[19] "In many minds a conviction existed, that, according to the ancient writings of the priests, the EAST should at that time become powerful, and that persons from Judæa should acquire rule, which ambiguity had predicted Vespasian and Titus. But the common people, as is customary with human cupidity, interpreted such greatness of destiny for itself." — **Tacitus**, *Hist.* **5**, 13. "Through the WHOLE EAST an ancient and uninterrupted opinion had gained thorough currency, as contained in the fates, that at that time persons from Judæa should obtain rule. . . . The Jews, appropriating it to themselves, had rebelled." — **Sueton.** *Vespas.* 4.

[20] Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 18, 1–9.

[21] An early operation was to burn the public records (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 17, 6), so as to destroy the evidences of debt. The small band of Roman soldiers, who were then in the city, surrendered after a promise of personal safety, which promise was only kept until they had laid down their arms (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 17, 10), when they were murdered. The palaces of Agrippa and Berenice were also burnt at the same time as the public records. And yet this class of miscreants employed teachers to persuade the people (*Wars*, **6**, 5, 2) that God would be their deliverer.

else from among those impatient ones who had become so irritated by the worldliness or harsh dealing of the conservatives, as to mistake antagonism to them [22] for service towards God. Outside of Judæa the movement may have continued to receive sympathy from many who were ignorant of its management, and deemed it the cause of God.

Jerusalem had concentrated many of the selfish and unscrupulous. The stream of offerings to the temple must have been a strong temptation to the money-loving.[23]

§ III. *Florus.*

Josephus charges Florus with bringing on the war by his oppression and with wishing to bring it on.[24] If so, his misdeeds must have PRECEDED its outbreak. It cannot have been owing to events WHICH TRANSPIRED AFTERWARDS. Josephus, however, does not specify one misdeed of Florus prior to the war's commencement. His charges of subsequent intentional wrong-doing wear a malevolent look. He mentions but two instances of pecuniary rapacity, which are placed in proximity, for the apparent purpose of strengthening each other.[25] Neither will bear scrutiny. It is a strong, indirect

---

[22] The Jewish aristocracy held, at first, the upper part of the city (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 17, 5), otherwise called Mount Sion, while the revolutionists held the lower city and temple. The latter caught the high-priest Ananias (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 17, 9) and murdered him.

[23] In a speech which Josephus puts into the mouth of Titus (*Wars*, **6**, 6, 2), the Jews are told that their permission to collect tribute everywhere had enabled them to use money collected from the Romans in preparing war against them. In the beginning of the war Florus removed seventeen talents from the temple (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 14, 6), much to the annoyance of the revolutionists, who had been calculating, no doubt, on using it for their own purposes. A plentiful pecuniary bait, habitually spread out, must have collected the unprincipled around it, even if it drew such men from the city alone. But Jerusalem was accustomed (Josephus, *Wars*, **4**, 3, 3) to admit from all quarters persons of Jewish descent. Rogues, even from a distance, would soon discern the advantages of a situation, where, under the appearance of zeal for religion, they could consult their own interest. Compare p. 33.

[24] Josephus, *Antiq.* **20**, 11, 1; *Wars*, **2**, 14, 3; **2**, 15, 3; **2**, 16, 1.

[25] Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 14, 5, 6. The two instances have been already mentioned. One was the acceptance of money (see note 3), probably in trust for a good object, namely, to buy a piece of ground for the Jews. This object at least is so obvious as to render improbable the twofold allegation of Josephus, that the principal Jewish citizens offered, and Florus accepted, money for an object which both he and THEY knew that he had no power to effect, namely, to prevent a man from building on

testimony to the honesty of Florus, that his bitter enemy can allege nothing worse. Some of his conduct implies an indisposition to use harsh measures.[26] If there be an instance of the reverse, it was due doubtless, in large measure, to the Jewish aristocracy.[27] A fact also which, in this connection, deserves consideration, is that in Cæsarea, where Florus resided, the majority of the population was Gentile, and yet the city government before the war was in Jewish hands; nor does Josephus allege that Florus had even the slightest connection with its transfer to Gentiles. This certainly does not look like oppression.

---

his own land. The second instance (see note 23) was the removal of money from the temple. It was doubtless done at the instance of the conservative Jews, who must have been urgent to prevent this money from being used by the revolutionists. Even without such prompting, Florus would have been inexcusably negligent had he left the money in a locality which was controlled by the insurgents. In another passage (*Wars*, **2**, 15, 6) Josephus treats the money as still in the temple.

[26] After the insurgents had already seized the tower of Antonia as well as the temple, the former of which implies an expulsion of the Roman garrison, Florus marched some troops to Jerusalem. These were met not merely by the peaceably disposed Jews, who (compare note 6) were, as afterwards, thankful for such interference, but by bands of revolutionists, whose subsequent action shows them to have been armed, and who insulted the soldiers. The soldiers made no answer, and, when force was called for, used only the butts of their weapons; see Josephus (*Wars*, **2**, 15, 3–5), where this forbearing behavior of the soldiers is studiously misrepresented. Immediately afterwards Florus left it to the high-priests and sanhedrim to say what number of troops they wished, and substituted for this band of soldiers another which had not come into collision with the people.

[27] **Josephus** says (*Wars*, **2**, 15, 1; *Life*, 4, 5) that the soldiery at Jerusalem behaved lawlessly, and that Berenice, then on a visit to Jerusalem (which, it must be remembered, was not in her brother's kingdom, nor in any wise under his control), asked Florus to stop "the murder." As Josephus does not previously specify any murder by the soldiers, we are left to conjecture concerning its nature and extent. It may have been unavoidable violence in repressing sedition, or the soldiery may have committed some excess, or the Jewish aristocracy, whose counsel Florus seems to have taken, may have advocated harshness. An impression which Josephus (*Ibid.*) strives to convey, that Berenice in the presence of Florus, and through his neglect, was in danger from his soldiery, must be a misrepresentation. She accompanied her brother subsequently on a visit to Florus, and was probably in much more danger from the Jewish insurgents than from Roman soldiers; see notes 11, 21, and 45.

§ IV. *Josephus.*

The picture of Josephus, as supplied by his writings, is very unfavorable. Self-laudation is in some persons connected with general honesty or benevolence. In his case it existed extravagantly, but stood in connection with dishonesty and brutality.[28] The latter quality does not affect his general credibility, but the former does. What reliance can be placed on the truthful intention of a writer who gives us such statements as those in the note,[29] concerning the political leanings of Sepphoris, or the character and statesmanship of Ananus,[30] or the question whether Josephus had a battle with Vespasian,[31]

---

[28] When some of his enemies were before his house (Josephus, *Life*, 30), he invited one of them in upon a false pretence, cut his hand off, tied it round his neck and put him out. The connection illustrates the reckless exaggeration of the writer. He states the force outside at six hundred, and winds up by saying that his boldness made them think that he had a larger force inside. A Galilean dwelling would have had scant room for fifty or a hundred men.

[29] **Josephus**, "knowing that the Romans would attack Galilee, walled suitable localities. . . . To the inhabitants of Sepphoris only he gave permission to rebuild their wall themselves, as he saw that they were wealthy and prompt for the war without command [from any one else.] In like manner John, the son of Levi, by himself (Josephus ordering) put a wall round Gischala." — *Wars*, **2**, 20, 6. Cp. (*Wars*, **3**, 4, 1.) "The city (Sepphoris) . . . which . . . he (Josephus) had walled."

"Sepphoris shut me out of the city and forbade any one of its citizens to enlist with the Jews, and for security against us, they outwitted me by being beforehand with their strengthening of the city by walls and from Cestius Gallus . . . they gladly received a guard, despising my then great power." — *Life*, 65.

The truth concerning John is, that he was in the employ of the conservative party (*Wars*, **4**, 3, 13), whom he had not, like Josephus, betrayed. The charges of Josephus (*Wars*, **4**, 3, 14), that John played false with the conservatives, may be owing to personal enmity, and to his having obtained the upper hand of Josephus (*Life*, 13), when the latter went over to the revolutionists.

[30] "Ananus, a most discreet man, and one likely to have saved the city had he escaped the hands of the conspirators." — *Wars*, **4**, 3, 7.

"Ananus and his associates being CORRUPTED BY GIFTS, agreed among themselves to put me out of Galilee." — *Life*, 39.

[31] "Vespasian with his force came to the borders of Galilee. . . . Those in camp with Josephus, not far from Sepphoris by a city called Garis, when they heard that the war was coming

"Concerning which [coming of Vespasian into Galilee], how it occurred, and how he fought HIS FIRST BATTLE AGAINST ME, near the village of Tarichеæ . . . I have narrated accurately

or how the people of Galilee were affected towards him?[32] What fidelity towards his readers can be expected from a writer who parades his lack of fidelity to men that had relied on his assurances?[33] When he treats subjects which presented no motive for misstatement we can, to a reasonable degree, trust him. Even from his attempted falsifications we can, by careful sifting, eliminate much truth. His works are, on some points, our only sources of information. They need a better translation, cross-references, intelligently written notes, and a much better index than Whiston's. A table of the Macedonian months used by Josephus should also be supplied.[34]

---

near, and that the Romans were barely not yet in it, scattered in flight, not only before a battle, but before seeing the enemies. Josephus was left with a few . . . taking those who remained he fled down to Tiberias." — *Wars*, **3**, 6, 3.

[32] "Josephus, by flying to the city which he had selected for safety, filled it with fear; . . . he anticipated [Vespasian] by getting into Jotapata from Tiberias." — *Wars*, **3**, 7, 2, 3.

in the Books of the Jewish War." — *Life*, 74.

"Such was the good-will and fidelity of most Galileans towards myself that . . . they bestowed less lamentation on their own misfortunes than solicitude on [effecting] my safety." — *Life*, 16.

[33] "Being desirous to catch Simon by a wile, and Joazar with him, I sent a message to them, and desired them to come a little way out of the city, with many of their friends to guard them; for I said I would come down to them, and make a league with them, and divide the government of Galilee with them. Accordingly Simon was deluded on account of his imprudence, and out of the hopes of gain, and did not delay to come; but Joazar, suspecting snares were laid for him, stayed behind. So when Simon was come out, and his friends with him for his guard, I met him, and saluted him with great civility, and professed that I was obliged to him for his coming up to me: but a little while afterward I walked along with him, as though I would say something to him by himself, and, when I had drawn him a good way from his friends, I took him about the middle, and gave him to my friends that were with me, to carry him into a village; and, commanding my armed men to come down, I with them made an assault upon Tiberias." — **Josephus**, *Life*, 63, Whiston's trans.

[34] The Macedonian months must originally have been lunar ones. When the Ephesians adopted Macedonian names (Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 225) they may have applied them to solar months. If their first month, *Dius*, began September 24 (Smith, *Ibid.*), it must have been intended to date from the Equinox, irrespective of the moon. Josephus (*Antiq.* **1**, 3, 3) identifies *Xanthicus* with the Hebrew *Nisan*, and says (*Ibid.*) that *Dius* corresponded to the second of the Hebrew [civil] months. To aid others, the following, perhaps incomplete, table of references to these months by Josephus in his *Wars* is added. Their num-

The narratives of Josephus pertain, aside from matters at Jerusalem, chiefly to the war, if it can be dignified with that name, in Galilee. Occasionally a passage seems to vie with the famous Munchausen,[35] while others, intended to conceal

---

bering represents the Macedonian order. Each month corresponds mainly with the successor of the modern one in which it begins.

No. Name.	Began in	A. D. 63 or 64.	A. D. 65.	A. D. 67.	A. D. 68.	A. D. 70.
5. Dystrus	*Jan.*				**4**, 7, 3	
6. Xanthicus	*Feb.*	**6**, 5, 3				**5**, 22, 7
7. Artemisius	*March*	**6**, 5, 3	**2**, 14, 4	**3**, 7, 3		**5**, 11, 4
			2, 15, 2			
8. Dæsius	*April*			**3**, 7, 29	**4**, 8, 1	
				31		
				32		
9. Panemus	*May*			**3**, 7, 36		**5**, 13, 7
						6, 1, 6
						6, 2, 1
10. Lous	*June*		**2**, 17, 7			**6**, 4, 5
						6, 8, 1
11. Gorpiæus	*July*		**2**, 17, 8	**3**, 10, 10		**6**, 8, 4
				4, 1, 10		**6**, 10, 1
12. Hyperberetæus	*Aug.*			**4**, 1, 9		
				4, 1, 10		
1. Dius	*Sept.*		**2**, 19, 9		A. D. 69.	
2. Apellæus	*Oct.*				**4**, 11, 1	
3. Audynæus	*Nov.*					
4. Peritius	*Dec.*					

Classical scholars will notice that Josephus in his *Wars*, **6**, 4, 5, arranges the month *Lous* in the same position as does Plutarch, whose accuracy (Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 225) has been questioned.

[35] "As for the inhabitants of the city of Tiberias, they wrote to the king, and desired him to send them forces sufficient to be a guard to their country. . . . Some Roman horsemen were discovered on their march, not far from the city, which made it to be supposed that the forces were come from the king; upon which they shouted, and lifted up their voices in commendations of the king, and in reproaches against me. Hereupon one came running to me, and told me what their dispositions were, and that they had resolved to revolt from me; upon hearing which news I was very much alarmed; for I had already SENT AWAY MY ARMED MEN FROM TARICHEÆ TO THEIR OWN HOMES, because the next day was our sabbath; . . . I immediately placed those my friends of Tarichеæ, on whom I could best confide, at the gates, to watch those very carefully who went out at those gates: I also called to me the heads of families, and bid every one of them to seize upon a ship, to go on board it, and to take a master with them, and follow him to the city of Tiberias. I also myself went on board one of those ships, with my friends, and the seven armed men already mentioned, and sailed for Tiberias.

"But now when the people of Tiberias perceived that there were no forces come from the king, and yet saw the whole lake full of ships, they were in fear what would become of their city, and were greatly terrified,

his reverses or misbehavior, assume, to an equal degree, gulli-

---

as supposing that the ships were full of men on board; so they then changed their minds, and threw down their weapons, and met me with their wives and children, and made acclamations to me, with great commendations; for they imagined that I did not know their former inclinations [to have been against me]; so they persuaded me to spare the city. But when I was come near enough, I gave order to the masters of the ships to cast anchor a good way off the land, that the people of Tiberias might not perceive that the ships had no men on board; but I went nearer to the people in one of the ships, and rebuked them for their folly, and that they were so fickle as, without any just occasion in the world, to revolt from their fidelity to me. However, I assured them, that I would entirely forgive them for the time to come, if they would send ten of the ringleaders of the multitude to me: and when they complied readily with this proposal, and sent me the men forementioned, I put them on board the ship, and sent them away to Taricheæ, and ordered them to be kept in prison.

"And by this stratagem it was, that I gradually got ALL THE SENATE of Tiberias into my power, and sent them to the city forementioned, with many of the principal men among the populace, and those NOT FEWER in number than the other. But when the multitude saw into what great miseries they had brought themselves, they desired me to punish the author of this sedition: his name was Clitus, a young man, bold and rash in his undertakings. Now since I thought it not agreeable to piety to put one of my own people to death, and yet found it necessary to punish him, I ordered Levi, one of my own guards, to go to him, and cut off one of Clitus's hands; but as he that was ordered to do this was afraid to go out of the ship alone, among so great a multitude, I was not willing that the timorousness of the soldiers should appear to the people of Tiberias. So I called to Clitus himself, and said to him, 'Since thou deservest to lose both thine hands for thy ingratitude to me, be thou thy own executioner, lest, if thou refusest so to be, thou undergo a worse punishment.' And, when he earnestly begged of me to spare him one of his hands, it was with difficulty that I granted it. So in order to prevent the loss of both his hands, he willingly took his sword, and cut off his own left hand; and this put an end to the sedition." — **Josephus**, *Life*, 32–34, Whiston's trans. In the *Wars*, Josephus says concerning the foregoing operations: "Under one new pretence or another, he called forth others, one after another, TO MAKE THE LEAGUES BETWEEN THEM. He then gave order to the masters of those vessels which he had thus filled, to sail away immediately for Taricheæ, and to confine those men in the prison there till at length he took all their senate, consisting of six hundred persons, and about two thousand of the populace, and carried them away to Taricheæ." — *Wars*, **2**, 21, 9, Whiston's trans.

Twenty-six hundred prisoners — even at the allowance of ten for each boat, a number sufficient to have pitched out the rowers and taken possession — would have required two hundred and sixty boats. As these had been placed in the distance, so as to conceal their emptiness, fifteen minutes would at least be required for each to attain the shore, take its load, and depart. At this, somewhat expeditious, rate the transfer of

bility in his readers.[36] Exaggeration of numbers is frequent in ancient writers, and is a fault common to uncritical minds. But in Josephus it is not merely excessive, it is unquestionably wilful.[37] Should we wish to determine in how far his

twenty-six hundred persons would have required sixty-five hours, or nearly three days and nights, during which the multitude must have stood on the shore and Josephus in his boat.

[36] When Josephus undertook with his marauders to plunder Sepphoris, some one of its inhabitants must have frightened them by calling out that the Romans were come. Josephus was the first to run. His narrative is: "The people of Sepphoris grew insolent, and took up arms, out of a confidence they had in the strength of their walls, and because they saw me engaged in other affairs also. So they sent to Cestius Gallus, who was president of Syria, and desired that he would either come quickly to them, and take their city under his protection, or send them a garrison. . . . The Galileans took this opportunity, as thinking they had now a proper time for showing their hatred to them, since they bore ill-will to that city also. They then exerted themselves, as if they would destroy them all utterly, with those that sojourned there also. So they ran upon them, and set their houses on fire, as finding them without inhabitants; for the men out of fear ran together to the citadel. So the Galileans carried off everything, and omitted no kind of desolation which they could bring upon their countrymen. When I saw this, . . . I bid those my friends, who were most faithful to me, and were about me, to give out reports, as if the Romans were falling upon the other part of the city with a great army; and this I did, that by such a report's being spread abroad, I might restrain the violence of the Galileans, and preserve the city of Sepphoris. And at length this stratagem had its effect; for upon hearing the report, they were in fear for themselves, and so they left off plundering, and ran away; and this more especially because they saw me, their general, do the same also." — **Josephus**, *Life*, 67, Whiston's trans. Compare § 11.

[37] According to a census of London just taken (see *Pittsburgh Commercial*, May 30, 1871) its size is 74,070 acres, and its population 3,250,000. This would give an average of nearly forty-four persons per acre. Jerusalem covered about four hundred acres within its walls. Its two-story houses could not accommodate so many as the higher edifices of London, and its aristocratic quarter cannot have been densely built, for the palaces of Agrippa and Berenice were burnt (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 17, 6) without, as it seems, causing a conflagration in adjoining buildings, and the view of the temple from the dining-room of the former must (Josephus, *Antiq.* **20**, 8, 11) have been unobstructed by buildings. Allowing it, however, an average of forty-four per acre, its population would be 17,600. Josephus states the number who perished in Jerusalem during its siege at 1,100,000 (*Wars*, **6**, 9, 3), besides 97,000 captives, and wishes us to believe (*Ibid.*) that on a prior occasion 2,700,200 ate the passover in Jerusalem, aside from the multitude of ceremonially unclean who could not partake. Such numbers are simply absurd. The military force under Josephus is by himself (*Wars*, **2**, 20, 6) stated at 100,000. The tenor of his narrative creates an impression that it never exceeded 1,000, and frequently consisted of but one or two dozen; see his *Life*, §§ 17, 18, 28, 29, 56–59.

doings are palliated by any strong current of anti-Roman feeling among his countrymen, it is worthy of consideration, that not only were such chief cities as Sepphoris and Tiberias conservative, but even at Taricheæ, four miles from Tiberias, a village where Josephus made his headquarters, the native population were opposed to the war, and were overridden solely by refuse foreigners.[38] Josephus must have had for companions simply, or chiefly, the refuse of distant localities.

Like many destitute of morality, Josephus stoutly advocated forms and ceremonies which had been connected with, or substituted for, religion.[39] His revolutionary associates,

---

[38] "All the innovators had gotten together at Taricheæ, as relying upon the strength of the city, and on the lake that lay by it. This lake is called by the people of the country *the Lake of Gennesareth*. . . . The inhabitants themselves, who had possessions there, and to whom the city belonged, were not disposed to fight from the very beginning; and now the less so, because they had been beaten; but the foreigners which were very numerous would force them to fight so much the more, insomuch that there was a clamor and a tumult among them, as all mutually angry one at another. . . . After this fight was over, Vespasian sat upon his tribunal at Taricheæ, in order to distinguish the foreigners from the old inhabitants; for these foreigners appeared to have begun the war."—**Josephus**, *Wars*, **3**, 10, 1, 4, 10. In his *Life*, § 32, **Josephus** says: "If I had given commission to the people of Taricheæ, and to the FOREIGNERS among them to plunder the city [of Tiberias], I saw that they would not be able."

[39] "Now as many of the Levites, which is a tribe of ours, as were singers of hymns, persuaded the king to assemble a sanhedrim, and to give them leave to wear linen garments, as well as the priests; for they said, that this would be a work worthy the times of his government, that he might have a memorial of such a novelty, as being his doing. Nor did they fail of obtaining their desire; for the king, with the suffrages of those that came into the sanhedrim, granted the singers of hymns this privilege, that they might lay aside their former garments, and wear such a linen one as they desired; and as a part of this tribute ministered in the temple, he also permitted them to learn those hymns as they had besought him for. Now all this was contrary to the laws of our country, which, whenever they had been transgressed, WE HAVE NEVER BEEN ABLE to avoid the punishment of SUCH transgressing."—**Josephus**, *Antiq.* **20**, 9, 6, Whiston's trans. "As for the dead bodies of the people, their relations carried them out to their own houses; but when any of the zealots were wounded, he went up into the temple, and DEFILED THAT SACRED FLOOR with his blood, insomuch, that one may say, it was their blood alone that polluted our sanctuary."—*Wars*, **4**, 3, 12, Whiston's trans. "Josephus stood in such a place where he might be heard, not by John only, but by many more. . . . Josephus said thus, with a loud voice, . . . 'Vile wretch that thou art! if any one should deprive thee of thy daily food, thou wouldst esteem him to be an enemy to thee; but thou hopest to have that God for thy

however, saw through him, and placed little trust in his fidelity.[40] His prediction of imperial power for Vespasian may have been merely a salutation, or address to him as *Imperator*, the former title of a general, rather than of emperor.[41] If he addressed Vespasian as *Cæsar*, the salutation could readily be accounted for *after* Nero's death in 68, since Vespasian then took pleasure in being so saluted;[42] but before that time it would have been very unlikely. If it took place in 68, it would render probable that Josephus has misplaced the siege of Jotapata from the end to the beginning of Vespasian's operations in Galilee, in order either to increase his own importance as the first enemy who needed attention, or that his prediction might seem not to have been prompted by existing circumstances and common conversation.[43] A cir-

---

supporter in this war, whom thou hast deprived of his everlasting worship.'" — *Wars*, **6**, 2, 1, Whiston's trans. The allusion is to the daily sacrifice, which had been stopped for want of victims.

[40] "Now when all Galilee was filled with this rumor, that their country was about to be betrayed by me to the Romans, and when all men were exasperated against me, and ready to bring me to punishment, the inhabitants of Taricheæ did also themselves suppose that what the young men said was true, and persuaded my guards and armed men to leave me when I was asleep, and to come presently to the hippodrome, in order there to take counsel against me, their commander." — **Josephus**, *Life*, 27, Whiston's trans. The conversation of Josephus, as narrated by himself, was well adapted to cultivate the alleged suspicions. He says: "When I had sent for some of those multitudes of the people of Tiberias out of prison, among whom were Justus and his father Pistus, I made them sup with me; and during our supper-time, I said to them, that I knew the power of the Romans was superior to all others, but did not say so [publicly], because of the robbers. So I advised them to do as I did, and to wait for a proper opportunity." — *Life*, 35, Whiston's trans.

[41] See, under Note G, the term *Imperator* in foot-notes 30, 31. According to Suetonius, *Vespas.* 5, the prediction was merely that Vespasian as an *Imperator* would set Josephus at liberty. This may have meant that the latter hoped to convince Vespasian of his having been throughout the war a good friend to the Romans.

[42] Vespasian was proclaimed emperor, July 1, A. D. 69. **Tacitus** must speak of an earlier date when he mentions (*Hist.* **2**, 76, 77) a speech of Mucianus, publicly exhorting Vespasian to assume imperial power; to which he adds (ch. 78), that "public rumor had promptly taken up, and was engaged in explaining these ambiguities, [supposed predictions of imperial power for Vespasian]. . . . He was spoken to [on the subject] more frequently, since the object hoped for is apt to be conversed upon." Probably from the date of Nero's death, or soon after, Vespasian and his friends were discussing his claims and prospects.

[43] The wording given to us by Josephus of his prediction is, of course, unreliable. It needs, however, but the change of one word to give it plausibility, provided it were uttered after Nero's death. The change is,

cumstance mentioned in the note gives some color to this supposition.[44]

§ v. *Agrippa and Berenice.*

Agrippa and Berenice, even as seen through the medium of Josephus, appear to advantage. In spite of provocation,[45] no instance is mentioned in which either advocated harshness, whilst both of them more than once show themselves friends of humanity.[46] The kingdom of Agrippa did not include Jerusalem, but his advice to its inhabitants was sensible,[47] and, for a time, not without effect on the better portion of them.

§ vi. *The Christians.*

Christians during the earlier commotions sympathized with the popular, rather than with the aristocratic party, and suffered somewhat at the hands of the latter.[48] When the Messianic excitement passed into revolution, and fell into the hands of unprincipled and violent men, the Christians must have lost their accord with it, for they left Jerusalem.[49] Probably they had among their number those who expected God to take issue with the Romans, as he had with the Egyptians, in the days of Moses, but who had no thought of assuming to take it themselves.

---

to substitute *Cæsar* for *Nero*, so that one of Nero's successors might be understood. "Do you send me to Nero [to Cæsar?]. . . . The successors of Nero remain [merely as] reliefs on guard, until [the coming of] yourself. You, Vespasian, are Cæsar, and you are *Imperator*, as also this, your son."—**Josephus**, *Wars*, **3**, 8, 9. Some unimportant grandiloquence, from the beginning and end of the speech, is omitted.

[44] Josephus represents Vespasian after the siege of Jotapata (*Wars*, **3**, 9, 1) as going into winter quarters in the month of June, — a credible thing in the year 68, after the country had been conquered, and after the death of Nero had temporarily diverted Vespasian's attention from the war, but very unlikely in the year 67.

[45] The palaces of Agrippa and Berenice were burnt (Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 17, 6), and the life of his subordinate, Philip, put in peril (Josephus, *Life*, 11) by the revolutionists; another palace at Tiberias, which must have belonged to the king (Josephus, *Life*, 12), was plundered and burnt; the wife of Ptolemy, the king's superintendent, was waylaid (Josephus, *Life*, 26) and her carriages plundered; ambassadors of the king were murdered. Berenice, who is cruelly calumniated by Josephus (*Antiq.* **20**, 7, 3), cannot have escaped similar misrepresentation from his coarse coadjutors and followers.

[46] Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 15, 1; **3**, 9, 8; *Life*, 65.

[47] Josephus, *Wars*, **2**, 16, 4.

[48] See Ch. VIII. notes 202, 203.

[49] According to Eusebius (*Ecc. Hist.* **3**, 5) the Christians left Jerusalem and went to a town named Pella, in what was called Perræa, beyond the Jordan.

NOTE J.

TWO MODERN WORKS.

§ I. *Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography.*

THE above work is a standard one, and therefore its errors should, if possible, be pointed out and corrected.

Its *Chronological Tables of Roman History* at the close of Vol. 3, need, in the first century, at least four emendations. Josephus was born in the first year of Caligula;[1] the Tables place his birth in the second. The Jewish war began in the twelfth year of Nero;[2] the Tables say in the thirteenth. Agricola died while Domitian was in Rome;[3] the Tables make the Emperor absent at the Sarmatian war.[4] Philo's embassy (see p. 217) reached Rome in the winter of 37 – 38; the Tables place it near the close of A. D. 40.

Several biographical articles in the Dictionary are written with too little appreciation of the fact, that our sources of information are chiefly patrician, and are colored by aristocratic views and feelings.

§ II. *Gibbon.*

The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire by Gibbon contains, in its statement of facts, many errors implying at times gross negligence. Some of these have already been pointed out.[5] Of a portion no reasonable explanation can be imagined, except that Gibbon took notes, and at a later day wrote from these, without re-examining his authorities. A writer, even if gifted with excellent memory, will find such a plan hazardous. It should never be adopted in matters of importance, nor in any case without warning to the reader.

---

[1] Josephus, *Life*, 1. He must have been born early in the year 37, or else must speak only approximately when saying in his *Life*, § 15, that he was about thirty years old when in the year 66 he became a revolutionist.

[2] See Note I, foot-note 2.

[3] See Note G, foot-note 136.

[4] Agricola died (Tacitus, *Agric.* 44) August 23 of A. D. 93. The *Tables* represent Domitian as setting out in May of 93 for the Sarmatian war, and as not returning until in the year 94.

[5] See pp. 136 n – 137 n, 159 n, 312 n, 441 n–442 n, 475 n.

In a passage of Gibbon already quoted,[6] Christians are represented as anticipating Rome's overthrow by *Northern* barbarians. This must refer to a period before Constantine, for it is stated among the causes which filled the Christian ranks. But expectations among them, of that event, were borrowed from the Jews, and any expected conquerors were accordingly *Eastern* ones.[7] Gibbon may have entered the word BARBARIANS in his notes and filled in the word "Northern" after his study of the Goths and Vandals, who did not, however, invade *heathen* Rome. Rome had become professedly Christian before their invasion.

Again, if we compare the two accounts of Commodus killing an ostrich, one by Dio Cassius, an eye-witness, and the other by Gibbon,[8] it seems probable that this latter historian must have taken notes from Herodian[9] as an amusing specimen of extravagance, and written them out subsequently when he had forgotten that a less marvellous narrative existed. Unless this be so, Gibbon lacks frankness towards his readers in omitting even to hint that a different and more reliable account was extant.

Further, the killing of bears, recorded by Dio Cassius, and

---

[6] See Ch. VI. note 47.

[7] See in Ch. IX. the last paragraph of note 26. Compare Ch. VI. § II. No. 3; and observe, in the Appendix, the absence from Note F, § III. of anything which might justify Gibbon's statement. **Lactantius**, when treating of Rome's destruction, says expressly (*Div. Inst.* **7**, 15), "Supreme power (*Imperium*) shall return to *Asia*. The *East* shall again rule and the West be subservient." His view is, in this respect, the same which Cicero, more than three centuries earlier (see Note A, foot-note 96) puts into the mouth of his Stoic — and therefore somewhat Judaizing — brother. If any Christian predicted Rome's overthrow by *Northern* barbarians, Gibbon has not pointed him out, nor have I found the passage.

[8] "Having killed an ostrich and cut off its head, he came to where we sat, holding in his left hand the head, and in his right the bloody sword. . . . I ate laurel leaves which I got from my crown, and persuaded others, who were sitting near me, to chew them, that by continual motion of our mouths we might conceal the evidence of our laughing." — **Dio Cass. 72**, 21.

"With arrows whose point was shaped into the form of a crescent, Commodus OFTEN intercepted the rapid career and cut asunder the long bony neck of the ostrich."—**Gibbon**, ch. 4, Vol. **1**, p. 106.

[9] According to Herodian (**1**, 15, 5), the ostrich was decapitated by a crescent-tipped arrow, and its body continued to run after its head was shot off. One would think that arrows so constructed would be likely to traverse the air wrong-end foremost.

of lions by Gibbon, are so likely to have been the same event[10] as to have claimed a word of caution, even if the historian found the latter in Herodian.

Gibbon's judgment, equally as his statement of facts, is repeatedly defective. His belief, that the Jews neither exercised, nor endeavored to exercise, influence on heathens,[11] is only palliated by their present condition. His estimate of the ruling class at Rome as PHILOSOPHERS,[12] is absurdly incorrect, and is inexcusable in one acquainted with English politics, and with the debasing influence of party strife.[13] His estimate of human happiness from the advent of Trajan to the death of Marc Antonine is no better.[14] How any one, after

---

[10] "On the first day he alone killed a hundred bears by throwing javelins from above, from the summit of the enclosing wall. For the amphitheatre was diametrically divided by connected walls, [these walls] having a roof whereon one could perambulate, and which intersected each other, so that the wild beasts, divided into four groups, could from a short distance be readily speared."— **Dio Cass. 72, 18.** "The dens of the amphitheatre disgorged at once a hundred lions. A hundred darts from the unerring hand of Commodus laid them dead, as they ran raging around the arena. Neither the huge bulk of the elephant, nor the scaly hide of the rhinoceros, could defend them from his stroke."— **Gibbon,** ch. 4, Vol. **1,** p. 106. Compare Herodian, **1,** 15, 5.

[11] See Ch. VII. note 51.

[12] "It is not easy to conceive from what motives a spirit of persecution could introduce itself into the Roman councils, . . . since the magistrates were themselves philosophers." — **Gibbon,** ch. 2, Vol. **1,** p. 35, edit. Phila. 1816. By substituting *unprincipled politicians* for the epithet *philosophers*, the character of these men would be far more accurately expressed. Let any one, after careful study of patrician politics, ask himself whether the designation schoolboyish would be too severe for Gibbon's estimate of these self-seeking politicians. Whether at the close of the first century they had ability enough to deserve even the name of politicians might be rendered doubtful by their childishness in pounding to pieces the images of Domitian (see Ch. X. note 39), or by their hugging Pliny, Junior, and overwhelming him with kisses after he had (*Epist.* **9,** 13, 21) uttered some of his spleen against an opponent. *Non fere quisquam in senatu fuit qui non me complecteretur exosculareturr.*

[13] Gibbon was for several years in Parliament. He accepted (Gibbon, *Memoirs*, p. 103, appended to Vol. **8,** of his *Decline and Fall*) a sinecure salary of $3,500 to $4,000 in a *Board of Trade*, which public indignation afterwards abolished (*Ibid.* p. 107); and, says **Gibbon,** "I was stripped of a convenient salary after having enjoyed it for about three years." He himself states (*Ibid.* p. 109), "My personal freedom had been somewhat impaired by the House of Commons and the Board of Trade," — a gentle method of saying, that for a stipulated price he had sold his vote and his expressions of opinion to those in power. Gibbon tells all this without the slightest apparent sense of shame. How could such a man do justice to history?

[14] "If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world

special study of that period, could utter such an opinion, seems incredible. His view of the improving influence upon society, exercised by the Roman festivals,[15] would, in another than himself, be mistaken for mere irony. His estimate of the Jews is appended;[16] also a sample use of his memory.[17]

---

during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would without hesitation name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus." — **Gibbon**, ch. 3, Vol. **1**, p. 89.

This period consisted of a brief reign by Nerva, whose kind-heartedness proved inadequate to suppress lawlessness; next Trajan, whose repeated wars furnished an admirable opportunity for army contractors, and all such as knew how to fill their pockets at public expense, and whose best remedy for a misgoverned province was the appointment of Pliny, Junior, a man that shielded culprits while he punished religious opponents; then Hadrian, who executed some of the aristocracy, lived in fear of assassination from the remainder, and whose war with the Jews rent society into factions that lasted half a century; subsequently Antoninus Pius, a man probably of justice and good sense, but concerning whose reign we know almost nothing. We do know, however, that asperities from the preceding reign still continued, and aside from famine, earthquake, and conflagration, already mentioned (Ch. XII. note 4), and a pestilence in Arabia (Capitolinus, *Antonin. Pius*, 9), we are told by **Capitolinus** (*Antoninus Pius*, 5, 6) that "he carried on many wars through his lieutenants, for he conquered the Britons . . . and compelled the Moors to seek peace, and put down the Germans and Dacians and many nations, as also the Jews who rebelled. In Achaia also and in Egypt he suppressed rebellions. He often checked the threatening Alani." After him came Marc Antonine, of whom mention will be found in Ch. XII. § 11. "He wished (*Script. Hist. August.* p. 56) to make Marcomannia a province and Sarmatia also." A not very happy result of this may be seen in Note H, foot-note 12. To what has already been given must be added "a pestilence so great (**Capitolinus**, *M. Anton.* 13, *Script. Hist. August.* p. 48) that the dead bodies were carried out in wagons and carts." On courts in this era see pp. 287 n, 313 n; on its literature, p. 387.

[15] "The Pontiffs . . . encouraged the public festivals, which humanize [!] the manners of a people." — **Gibbon**, ch. 2, Vol. **1**, p. 36. See action against festivals by Flaccus, p. 97 n., and Claudius, p. 225 n.; compare public amusements, Ch. X. notes 58, 59.

[16] "The sullen obstinacy with which they maintained their peculiar rites and unsocial manners seemed to mark them out a distinct species of men, who boldly professed, or who faintly disguised, their implacable hatred to the rest of human-kind. . . . According to the maxims of universal toleration, the Romans protected [!] a superstition which they despised." — **Gibbon**, *Rome*, ch. 15, Vol. **2**, p. 59.

[17] In the acrostics on page 444, Gibbon connects the words "Savior," "Cross," translating them from memory it would seem, "Savior of the world." Connection of the two words has been a common or universal error. Their mistranslation is Gibbon's own.

NOTE K.

XENOPHON, PLATO, AND HERACLITUS.

§ 1. *Xenophon.*

1. Xenophon and Plato lived in the century which witnessed the founding of Alexandria and the apportionment to Jews of, approximately, one third its area. Both travelled, the former as a soldier, the latter as a philosopher, in regions where the Jews must already have been spreading their views. Neither evinces Jewish influence to the same extent as did the Stoics of the next century. Some peculiarities of their writings, however, admit explanation with difficulty in any other way than by supposing that they had, directly or at second hand, borrowed from Jewish teaching. Aside also from these peculiarities, some of Plato's views have an interest in connection with our subject, which calls for their introduction.

2. Xenophon, though less versatile than Plato, is free from the trifling which soils the latter. His points of resemblance with Judaism, except one or two of phraseology, are those which might, without prompting, engage attention from a thoughtful moralist. Whether a soldier, who devoted much attention to military matters, politics, and horses, was likely, unaided, to attain these views is more questionable. Whether he obtained them from Socrates will claim a subsequent remark.

Xenophon, without specifying, or hinting at, any heathen deity as man's creator, uses, in the singular, the expression, "He who in the beginning made human beings."[1] Almost the same language appears in one of the gospels[2] as a quotation from Jewish Scripture, and we find closely corresponding phraseology in the Greek (LXX.) translation of the Old Testament.[3] The coincidence is singular, unless Xenophon had

---

[1] Ὁ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ποιῶν ἀνθρώπους. — **Xenophon**, *Memorabil.* **1**, 4, 5.

[2] "Have you not read, that ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς . . . αὐτούς. 'He who in the beginning made . . . them.'" — **Matthew 19**, 4.

[3] Ἐν ἀρχῇ . . . ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπον. In the beginning . . . God made man. — **Genesis, 1**, 1, 27. ποίημα ὃ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. "The creation (or work) which God in the beginning made." — **Ecclesiastes, 3**, 11.

learned his phraseology from monotheists, and it is the more remarkable since his words can HARDLY HAVE BEEN INTELLIGIBLE to a person acquainted merely with heathen views and traditions.

3. Again, we find that Xenophon uses the word *πρόνοια*, disconnected from any explanatory substantive or adjective, to designate DIVINE Providence,[4] a use previously unknown to classic literature.[5] If he introduced this new meaning he was copied not merely by Stoics, but by JEWS in Asia Minor,[6] a very unlikely thing. Jewish views could not be taught in Greek without some term to express God's superintending care, a care unknown to Greek mythology. Xenophon, if thoughtful, could not travel in lands where monotheism was spreading, without noticing some of its ideas and phraseology. It is much more likely that in this instance these were copied than invented.

4. Xenophon argues, or puts into the mouth of Socrates an argument, for the existence of divine planning and care. The adduced proof is the evidence of benevolent design afforded by man's physical and mental constitution.[7] This argument is found in Jewish,[8] but not in heathen teaching of earlier date. If Xenophon's statement be accurate, that he heard Socrates use it, then he himself at least did not bring it from the land of monotheism.[9] Literary habits at that date call for caution in taking such statements literally.[10] Socrates, if not misrepresented, took satisfaction in badgering rulers,[11] —

---

[4] *Memorabil.* **1**, 4, 6. Benevolent foresight, not moral aid, is the manifestation of Providence, which the passage specially brings into view.

[5] **Liddell** and **Scott's Lexicon** gives under the second definition of *πρόνοια*, "FROM PLATO DOWNWARDS, the providence of the gods, divine providence." I am unaware of such use in Plato, but it is not earlier among heathens.

[6] See p. 47, note 20.

[7] Xenophon, *Memorabil.* **1**, 4, 5–18.

[8] See Ch. III. note 57.

[9] Xenophon, *Memorabil.* **1**, 4, 2.

[10] Compare Ch. VII. note 97. Xenophon begins his work *De Administratione Domestica*, by saying that it was a conversation of Socrates to which he had listened. It covers ninety-three pages in Weiske's edition.

[11] "Socrates inquired of them, if he might be permitted to ask a question as to any point in the prohibitions that might not be understood by him. They gave him permission. 'Then,' said he, 'I am prepared to obey the laws; but that I may not unconsciously transgress through ignorance, I wish to ascertain exactly from you, whether it is because

a trait compatible with capacity for exposing error, but not likely to co-exist with that mental elevation and reverent appreciation of divine goodness which seems requisite in the ORIGINATOR of such an argument. Fewer qualifications are needed to accept, than to discover it. There is a second and cogent reason for mistrusting Socrates as originator of the argument under consideration. He was, if his pupils can be trusted, a polytheist, but the argument is inconsistent with polytheism. If Socrates himself had met with some monotheist, it might account not merely for a use of this argument by him, but for his demon.[12]

5. Xenophon assumes, as a fair inference from the preceding, that such as accepted the reasoning would regard their actions, even in solitude, as seen by the gods, and gives

---

you think that the art of reasoning is an auxiliary to what is rightly spoken, or to what is not rightly spoken, that you give command to abstain from it; for if it be an adjunct to what is rightly spoken, it is plain that we have to abstain from speaking rightly; but if to what is not rightly spoken, it is plain that we ought to endeavor to speak rightly.' Charicles, falling into a passion with him, said, 'Since, Socrates, you are ignorant of this particular, we give you an order more easy to be understood, *not to discourse at all with the young.*'

"'That it may not be doubtful, then,' said Socrates, 'whether I do anything contrary to what is enjoined, define for me till what age I must consider men to be young.' 'As long,' replied Charicles, 'as they are not allowed to fill the office of senator, as not being yet come to maturity of understanding; and do not discourse with such as are under thirty years of age.'

"'And if I wish to buy anything,' said Socrates, 'and a person under thirty years of age has it for sale, may I not ask him at what price he sells it?' 'Yes, such questions as these,' replied Charicles, 'but you are accustomed to ask most of your questions about things, when you know very well how they stand; such questions, therefore, do not ask.'

"'If, then, any young man,' said he, 'should ask me such a question as where does Charicles live? or where is Critias? may I not answer him if I know?' 'Yes, you may answer such questions,' said Charicles. 'But,' added Critias, 'it will be necessary for you to abstain from speaking of those shoemakers, and carpenters, and smiths; indeed I think that they must now be worn out, from being so often in your mouth.'

"'I must therefore,' said Socrates, 'abstain from the illustrations that I attach to the mention of those people, illustrations on justice, piety, and other subjects.' 'Yes, by Jupiter,' retorted Charicles."—**Xenophon,** *Memorabil.* **1**, 2, 33–37, Bohn's trans.

The law was, according to Xenophon, a general one, though he deems it specially aimed at Socrates. These rulers were the antagonists of those who put Socrates to death.

[12] Judaism taught an EVER-PRESENT Deity. The demon of Socrates is certainly not the God of Judaism. But it MAY have been a misconception, based on some of the monotheistic teachings concerning God.

Socrates the credit of thus exercising wholesome influence over young men. This idea of divine watchfulness over human transgression was familiar to Jews. It certainly was not FAMILIAR, nor perhaps even known, to heathens outside of Jewish influence. We shall find in the next section that Plato, also a pupil of Socrates, assumes human character, while men are in the body, to be invisible to the gods.

§ II. *Plato.*

1. Plato teaches, or ascribes to Socrates, sundry views common among Jews, but previously unknown to heathens in his own country. It might be a mistake to assume his inability to originate any of them. Yet it would certainly be a mistake to imagine him travelling where these views were held[13] and taking no cognizance of them. We find in his writings Creation and a Creator, and a rude approximation to the doctrine of Providence and a Judgment. His teachings on these subjects may not be consistent with each other, nor with moral earnestness, nor with his views on other topics. Yet the question, whether they did, or did not, originate independently of Judaism, claims attention. On this point we shall first examine consecutively some appearances of his having borrowed, and thereafter some difficulties in the way of his having originated.

2. Plato's account of creation, though verbose and imaginative, has, in its order of events, so much resemblance to that in Genesis as to preclude easy belief of its total independence.[14]

---

[13] Plato visited Egypt and Cyrene. The former must, and the latter may already, in his time, have been the residence of many Jews. He also "explored the extremities of the earth" (*Ultimas terras lustrasse Pythagoram, Democritum, Platonem accepimus.* — **Cicero**, *Tuscul. Quæst.* **4**, 1), an expression which in Cicero's mouth must be understood of Oriental countries. Tradition mentions no visit to ignorant South Africa or North Europe. The testimony of Lactantius is free from doctrinal bias, and is more specific. "I am accustomed to wonder, that when Pythagoras and subsequently Plato, incited by love of searching into truth, penetrated to Egypt and the Magi and even to the Persians . . . they yet did not go to the [land of the] Jews." — **Lactant.** *Div. Inst.* **4**, 2.

[14] The Timæus is here given in Bohn's translation. The pages in parenthesis are those of Ast.

GENESIS.	PLATO'S TIMÆUS.
"The earth was without form and void." — 1. 2.	"The deity . . . took everything . . . in excessive . . . disorder, and then reduced it . . . into order." — Ch. 10, p. 334 (138).

3. In Genesis two accounts of creation are given, one of which represents man and woman as created at different times.[15] The other represents them as simultaneously formed, and is so worded as to permit misapprehension that they had but one body,[16] — a misapprehension which could be suggested, or confirmed, by confusing with it a subsequent figurative expression.[17] Plato seems either to have misunderstood or burlesqued this part of the narrative. In his Table-Talk he alleges that besides man and woman there originally existed a duplicate being, a man-woman.[18] This conception he so am-

"God made the firmament . . . and called the firmament heaven" — **1**, 7, 8.

"Let there be lights in the firmament . . . to divide day from night and . . . for signs and seasons and days and years." — **1**, 14.

"God said, Let the waters bring forth . . . fowls that may fly." — **1**, 20.

"God created great whales." — **1**, 21.

"God said, Let the earth bring forth . . . cattle." — **1**, 24.

"God saw everything . . . and behold it was very good." — **1**, 31. *ηὐφραίνετο τὴν οἰκουμένην συντελέσας.* — **Prov. 8**, 31.

"The framer of the worlds produced . . . this the solely begotten heaven." Ch. 11, p. 335 (140).

"God . . . contrived the days and nights, months and years, . . . with this design . . . the Deity . . . created the sun, moon, and the five other stars . . . to distinguish . . . time." — Ch. 14, pp. 341, 342 (152–154).

"The creator constructed . . . the heavenly race of gods, [i. e. the stars] another winged and air-wandering race, a third, that which dwells in water, and a fourth, that which has feet and walks on the ground. — Ch. 15, p. 343 (156).

"He was delighted *ἠγάσθη τε καὶ εὐφρανθείς* with his work." — Ch. 14, p. 340.

[15] Genesis, **2**, 7, 21, 22. See the twofold account in Note L.

[16] "God made *τὸν ἄνθρωπον*, A HUMAN BEING. . . . He made THEM male and female." — **Gen. 1**, 27.

[17] "The two shall be ONE FLESH." — **Gen. 2**, 24.

[18] "In the first place, there were three kinds of human beings, not as at present, only two, male and female; but there was also a third common to both of those; the name only of which now remains, it has itself disappeared. It was then [one] man-woman, whose form and name partook of and was common to both the male and the female. But it is now nothing but a name, given by way of reproach. In the next place, the entire form of every individual of the human race was rounded, having the back and sides as in a circle. It had four hands, and legs equal in number to the hands; and two faces upon the circular neck, alike in every way, and one head on both the faces placed opposite, and four ears, . . . and from these it is easy to conjecture how all the other parts were (doubled). THEY walked, as now, upright, whithersoever they pleased. And when IT made haste to run, it did, in the manner of tumblers, who, after turning their legs (upward) in a circle, place them accurately in an upright position, support itself on its eight limbs, and afterwards turn itself over quickly in a circle." — **Plato**, *The Banquet*, 16, Bohn's trans. This animal was subsequently bisected, and threatened with further surgery if it did not behave.

plifies as to create the impression that he and his hearers were badly off for sensible occupation. Either he must have loved to excite wonder, or must himself have been the victim of some other person's vivid imagination. The folly did not stop here. A sculptor of that era undertook to represent this man-woman.[19] At a later date a divine appellation, *Hermaphrodite*, or Mercury-Venus, was invented for it, perhaps to rescue it from ridicule or from taint of Judaism.

4. Again, Jewish writers, in their effort to express divine power, speak of the hills as smoking, or melting, at God's touch, or presence, and one writer mentions them and their forests as ignited by God's lightning.[20] Plato represents them, rather than the plains, as catching fire from proximity to the sun, or to heavenly bodies.[21] This is so opposite to human experience, — which finds increased cold with increase of elevation, — that we cannot suppose Plato to have taken his conception from natural laws. His invention of the idea would be discreditable to his common-sense. A use of it by him, if picked up, may be slightly less so.

5. The term "Lucifer," *Light-bearer*, or *Dawn-bringer*, is used in Isaiah[22] as an appellation for the planet, which among Greeks and Romans, prior to Jewish influence, was commonly called Venus. Plato also uses the term "Lucifer,"[23] or rather the corresponding Greek term ἑωσφόρος, which appears in the Greek translation of the Old Testament.

---

[19] In **Smith**, *Dict. of Biog.* art. *Polycles*, two statuaries are mentioned, the earlier of whom, living in B. C. 370, is credited with sculpturing a Hermaphrodite. The same work, art. *Hermaphroditus*, says that, "The FIRST celebrated statue of an hermaphrodite was that by Polycles."

[20] "The hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord."—**Psalm 97**, 5. "He looketh on the earth and it trembleth, he toucheth the hills and they smoke."—**Psalm 104**, 32, Noyes's trans. Compare Nahum **1**, 5, and Deuteronomy **32**, 22, quoted in Ch. III. note 14. "And the fire [lightning], sent from above to consume hills and woods, doeth as it is commanded."—**Baruch 6**, 63.

[21] "At certain long intervals of time, the earth's surface is destroyed by mighty fires. When this occurs, then those who dwell either on mountains or in lofty and dry places perish in greater numbers; . . . when the gods, to purify the earth, deluge its surface with water, then the herdsmen and shepherds on the mountains are preserved in safety." —**Plato**, *Timæus*, 5, Bohn's trans. The fire is attributed to depression in heavenly bodies, τῶν περὶ γῆν καὶ κατ' οὐρανὸν ἰόντων παράλλαξις. (Ast's edit. Vol. **5**, p. 124.)

[22] "Lucifer, son of the morning."—**Isaiah 14**, 12.

[23] Plato, *Epinomis*, 9, Ast's edit. **8**, p. 36. If the *Epinomis* be, as some think, no work of Plato, this argument should be dropped from the series.

6. Plato in his Timæus attributes to the world a soul.[24] This resembles the Stoic view,[25] taken, not from Plato, but from Judaism. The Stoics were opponents of Plato, and all evidence shows that they borrowed not from him, but from a monotheistic quarter. It is more likely that Plato also borrowed than that he originated this view. The details connected with it may be chiefly his own.

7. Plato applies to the deity the term "Father" in the same sense as did the Stoics, namely, to designate him as Source, or Origin, of all things.[26] The Stoics learned their phraseology in Asia Minor and Syria, where they originated,[27] and Plato probably learned his in the same quarter. It could only originate with a monotheist, since it implies a Being, the Source of all things. Analogous phraseology is found in Jewish writings.[28]

8. Plato, equally with Xenophon, knows nothing of divine interposition in behalf of individual morality. He teaches, however, that the gods take cognizance of, and pay judicial attention to the details of human affairs. Thus far he teaches a Providence. He also teaches a Judgment. In advocating the former he assumes that we cannot ascribe to the gods ignorance of, or indifference to, human affairs.[29] In

---

[24] "As for the soul he [the Creator] fixed it in the middle. . . . By this procedure then he produced the universe, a blessed God." — **Plato.** *Timæus*, 12, Bohn's trans.; Ast's edit. **5**, p. 146.

[25] See Ch. III. notes 6, 61, 63.

[26] **Plato** in his *Timæus*, 14, p. 37 C, Ast's edit. **5**, p. 152, after describing creation, speaks of the Originator as "the Father who begot" the universe; and in the same work, 9, p. 28 C, Ast's edit. **5**, p. 136, says that "it is a work to discover the Maker and Father of this universe, and it is impossible for one who has discovered him to mention him to all."

[27] See Ch. III. note 3.

[28] See Ch. III. note 40.

[29] The argument will be found in the Laws, **10**, 10–13, pp. 899–905; Ast. **7**, pp. 270–286. Throughout it the term *πρόνοια* does not occur. Plato uses this term elsewhere (*Timæus*, 18, 19, pp. 44 C, 45 A; Ast. **5**, pp. 168, 170), in one case to denote foresight of the gods in forming man, and in the other to designate a human faculty. At the close of his argument is an expression so similar to one in the Old Testament that it claims record.

Old Testament.	Plato.
"If I ascend into heaven, thou art there. "If I make my bed in the Underworld, behold, thou art there."—**Ps. 139, 8.**	"You will never be overlooked by it [divine watchfulness], though in humility you should descend to the depths of the earth, or if in exaltation you should fly up into heaven." — *Laws*, **10**, 13, p. 905, A (Ast. **7**, p. 284).

teaching the latter he assumes that the gods at first left the matter to incompetent judges,[30] and that neither they nor their chief, then or subsequently, gave personal attention to judgment. Instead of this, the decision upon men's character was subsequently delegated to a couple of judges, who must have been imperfect, since they were expected in some cases to be in doubt. When this occurred a third judge was to be called in, not that he was infallible, but that the nearest approach to justice might be obtained.[31] His teaching concerning judgment pointedly contradicts his allegations of divine watchfulness.

9. A portion of the Jews taught a future life on this earth. The good were to enjoy a thousand years of happiness, while the wicked were yet under ground.[32] The Buddhists teach transmigration. Plato seems to have borrowed from both, and to have added or altered from his imagination. He taught transmigration, and that after the wicked had been a thousand years under ground, and the good for a thousand years in happiness, both would be returned to this life, having first, however, drunk the waters of forgetfulness.[33] His details differ from the Jewish ones.[34]

---

[30] "During the reign of Saturn, and even recently, when Jupiter held the government, there were living judges of the living, who passed sentence on the very day on which any one was about to die. In consequence of this, sentences were awarded badly. . . . Jupiter, therefore, said, I will prevent this in future. For now sentences are badly awarded, because those that are judged are judged clothed, for they are judged while living. . . . They must be judged divested of all these things; for they must be judged after they are dead; the judge, too, must be naked and dead, and examine with his soul the soul of each immediately after death."—**Plato**, *Gorgias*, 166, 167, p. 523 B, C, E, Bohn's trans; Ast. **1**, p. 458.

[31] "Rhadamanthus shall judge those from Asia, and Æacus those from Europe. But to Minos I will give the prerogative of deciding in case any doubt occurs to the two others, in order that the judgment respecting the path men are to take may be as just as possible."—**Plato**, *Gorgias*, 168, p. 524 A, Bohn's trans.; Ast. **1**, p. 460.

[32] Justin Martyr evidently regarded his millennial views (*Dial.* 80, quoted in *Underworld Mission*, pp. 164–168) as in sympathy with those of his Jewish opponents. Jews doubtless shared with Jewish Christians the belief that after the resurrection of the just (**Rev. 20**, 5) "the other dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished."

[33] The account will be found in his *Republic*, **10**, 13–16, pp. 614–621; Ast. **5**, pp. 90–108.

[34] That view of the Jews with which we are most familiarized through writings of Jewish Christians, places the resurrection of the unjust subsequently to that of the just, which Plato does not. It is probable, how-

10. In arguing for the existence of gods,[35] Plato distinguishes between objects which have the power of self-motion (meaning animate ones) and those which have not.[36] Motion requires a cause, and therefore priority in date must be given to ANIMATE existence, that is, to soul.[37] Soul must therefore guide and administer heaven, earth, and sea.[38]

He intended, perhaps, to disparage any argument for the EXISTENCE of God, or gods, from evidence of design in the universe. He uses the good order of the latter merely to establish the CHARACTER of its guide, or guides.[39]

---

ever, that the Egyptian Jews held quite different views from those of Syria and Palestine touching details of the future life. Alexandrine Christians (see *Underworld Mission*, **22**, 3) held that righteous followers of Christ went to heaven at death. Alexandrine Jews probably held the same view concerning the just of their own race. The Ascension of Isaiah is likely to have copied their ideas when it places in heaven (Ch. **9**, 6–9) the Jewish saints. This would accord better with Plato's idea that the good, at death, were, for a thousand years, transferred to heaven.

[35] The argument is in the *Laws*, **10**, 1–9, pp. 885 D–900 D. In chapter 1, p. 886 A, Plato causes a speaker to introduce two arguments, one from order in the universe implying evidence of design, and the other from the common opinion of mankind, both of Greeks and Barbarians. Plato, in answering, ignores, apparently, the former argument and ridicules the latter.

[36] "Let then one [kind of?] motion be that which is able to move other things, but is ever unable to move itself; and let the other be that which is ever able to move both itself and other things, . . . and let this motion be different from [or superior to] all the other motions."—*Laws*, **10**, 6, p. 894 B, C, D, Bohn's trans. According to **Cicero's** understanding of this passage (*De Nat. Deorum*, **2**, 12) it should be translated: "Let there be ἡ μὲν ἕτερα one [of two moving bodies] competent [under outward impulse] to move—a certain one, however, powerless always to move itself: ἡ δ' . . . ἄλλη μία τις and yet another one competent always to move [both] itself and other things." Another passage, however, of Plato (*Phædrus*, 51, p. 245 C), copied also by Cicero (*Tusc. Quæst.* **1**, 23; cp. *De Republica*, **6**, 18), supports the former translation.

[37] "Which of the above-mentioned motions must necessarily exist the first? That surely which moves itself. . . . Do you mean that the thing which moves itself is the definition of that existence which we all call by the name of soul? Yes, I do. . . . Soul has been sufficiently shown to be the most ancient of all things and the commencement of motion."—*Laws*, **10**, 7, p. 895 A, B, 896 A, B, Bohn's trans.

[38] "Let us not then lay down less than two [souls], one the beneficent and the other able to effect things of a contrary kind. . . . Soul then leads everything in heaven and on the earth and in the sea."—*Laws*, **10**, 8, p. 896 E.

[39] "If . . . the whole path of heaven . . . possess a nature similar to . . . reasonings of mind . . . we must say that the MOST EXCELLENT soul takes care of the whole world."—*Laws*, **10**, 8, p. 898 C.

Plato next assumes without argument or proof the following two propositions: that each of the heavenly bodies and of other enumerated things is guided by an INDIVIDUAL soul,[40] and that this soul is A GOD.[41] Having assumed these two unproved propositions, his conclusion is inevitable, that a multitude of gods exist.[42]

If we now turn to another of his works, we find that an excited discussion on the origin of motion pervaded Ephesus and Ionia.[43] The description of it is so vivid as to create the belief that Plato had been in its midst. Towards determining its history and character we have merely the following information. The views, advocated with such warmth, must have

---

[40] "ATHENIAN. If a soul leads round the sun and moon and the other stars, does it not do so to each singly? CLINIAS. How not? ATHENIAN. Let us then direct our arguments to one (luminary), that they may appear to suit all the stars."—*Laws*, **10**, 9, p. 898 D, Bohn's trans.

[41] "ATHENIAN. And this too is surely better; for every man to consider this very soul as a god. . . . CLINIAS. Yes, (for every man) surely who has not arrived at the extremity of silliness."—*Laws*, **10**, 9, p. 899 A; Bohn's trans.

[42] "ATHENIAN. But with respect to all the stars and the moon and years and months and all the seasons, shall we give any other account than this, that, since a soul or souls, good in every virtue, are seen to be the causes of all these things, we will call them gods, whether they exist in bodies, as being animals, and put in order the whole of heaven by whatever road or in whatever manner (they do so)? nor is there the person who, assenting to this, would endure (to say) that all things are not full of gods. CLINIAS. There is not, O guest, a person so insane."—*Laws*, **10**, 9, p. 899 B, C, Bohn's trans.

[43] "SOCRATES. Let us, then, approach nearer to it, . . . and examine this essence, that is said to consist in motion. . . . For the contest about it is neither mean nor among a few. THEODORUS. It is very far from being mean, but is spreading very much throughout Ionia. For the partisans of Heraclitus advocate this doctrine very strenuously. . . . With respect to these Heraclitian, or, as you say, Homeric, and even older doctrines, it is no more possible to converse about them with the people of Ephesus who pretend to be acquainted with them, than with persons who are raving mad. For, just as their written doctrines, they are truly in constant motion, but to keep an argument and a question, and quietly answer and ask in turn, is less in their power than anything; or rather the power of rest in these men is infinitely less than nothing. But if you ask any one of them a question, they draw out, as from a quiver, certain dark enigmatical words, and shoot them off; and if you wish to get from him a reason for what he has said, you will be forthwith stricken with another newly coined word, but will never come to any conclusion with any one of them; nor do they with one another, but they take very good care not to allow anything to be fixed, either in their discourse or in their souls."—*Theætetus*, 92, pp. 179 D, E, 180 A, Bohn's trans.

been novel, for a flood of new words had been coined to express them. They were alleged to be views of Heraclitus, whose reputed tenets coincide with those subsequently known as Stoic,[44] and whose personal temperament forbids the idea that he was a propagandist.[45] Probably Jews had already arrived at Ephesus, their subsequent stronghold, and had by their teachings given rise to discussion. Heathens who adopted new views named them after their deceased townsman, whose notedly obscure writings[46] may have permitted different schools of followers.

Plato assumes a good and an evil being,[47] thus approximating to Jewish views of God and Satan. One of his remarks, also, is, *possibly*, borrowed from Judaism.[48] The discussion in Ionia may have turned his attention to the origin of motion. His views here do not harmonize readily with his account of creation.[49]

11. Plato attributes to the gods a better character, in several respects, than was conceded to them by many others.[50] He thinks that they must at least equal good human workmen, who always pay attention to details, and that they cannot be bought by bribes. In this connection, if in any, we might expect an inference that they encourage human morality. Plato, however, neither draws such a one nor alludes to it. His inference is, that RIGHT-MINDED atheists should be imprisoned or put to death, and something worse done to the others.[51]

---

[44] See § 111.

[45] See note 66.

[46] "His style was so obscure and so difficult to be understood, that the Greeks surnamed him *the unintelligible*."—**Am. Cyclopædia**, art. *Heraclitus*. Part of the obscurity may have been due to his use of foreign idioms.

[47] See note 38.

[48] "There shall no man see me and live."—**Exod. 33, 20.**

"Let us not then look at the sun . . . as if we could ever with mortal eyes see and recognize perfectly [a divine] mind."—**Plato**, *Laws*, **10**, 8, p. 897 E.

[49] Compare note 14.

[50] His views will be found in his *Laws*, **10**, 10–14, pp. 899 D–907 D, Bohn's trans.

[51] "To him who may think that gods do not exist at all, there may be a naturally just habit (of mind); and such become the haters of the wicked; . . . they avoid the unjust, and love the just. . . . Such as have become so through folly, without a vicious frowardness and manners, let the judge appointed by law put into the House of Correction,

12. Plato's mind seems to have been restlessly active, rather than quietly thoughtful. His love of talking,[52] manifest in all his writings, and tincturing his whole style, must have precluded MATURE reflection. For the reformation of mankind his chief panacea was force.[53] A set of office-holders, whom he euphemistically terms GUARDIANS,[54] were to manage other people's business, so that no one could move right hand or left without their permission. He does not say how these men were to be selected, nor what should prevent self-seekers from obtaining office. These men should forbid religious practices in private,[55] and punish unbelief.[56] They should control education,[57] as also human occupations and habits of

---

for not less than five years. . . . And when the period of their imprisonment expires, if any one amongst them . . . is again convicted on such a suit, let him pay the penalty of death. But such as, in addition to their believing that gods do not exist, or that they are careless, or easily turned aside, become brute-like, . . . let the court of justice determine that he is to be imprisoned according to law, . . . and when he dies, let him be cast out, beyond the boundaries of the country, unburied; and if any freemen shall together bury him, let the party undergo punishment for impiety [or rather, for unbelief]." — *Laws*, **10**, 15, pp. 908 B, E, 909 A, B, C, Bohn's trans.

[52] The article on Plato in the **Am. Cyclopædia** bears internal evidence of being penned by one of his admirers. It attributes to him "the richness of invention, the exuberant imagery, the never-failing vivacity, and we may add the garrulity of Homer." — Vol. **13**, p. 384, col. 1. The last remark is certainly within bounds. Plato uses pages where lines should suffice.

[53] According to the **American Cyclopædia** (**5**, p. 127, col. 1), Confucius held that "Disobedience is the greatest of THE THREE THOUSAND crimes." If this quotation be correct, the Chinese philosopher, equally with Plato, must have relied for human improvement on multitudinous and minute directions, enforced from outside, rather than on appeal to moral sense. Compare p. 384, note 40. Better acquaintance with Chinese history than any yet attainable will be necessary, before later and perhaps monotheistic maxims can be distinguished from the original ones of Confucius.

[54] See *Republic*, **2**, 15, 16, 21, pp. 374 E, 375 C, D, E, 376 C, 383 C; *Laws*, **8**, 1, pp. 828 B, 829 D.

[55] See Ch. II. note 16.

[56] See note 51.

[57] "In all states it is a thing unknown to all, that the family of games is of the greatest power in the laying down of laws, as to whether what are laid down will remain or not. For if it is so ordered, that the same persons shall always use the same . . . and be delighted with the same playthings, it permits the institutions laid down with seriousness to remain quiet. But when the sports are disturbed, and innovations made in them, and they are affected constantly by changes, . . . we should, by saying that no greater bane could happen to a state than by such a

life.[58] Could Plato have reappeared in Russia under Nicholas, he would have found governmental sanction for his tenet that a father must not educate his children otherwise than as the state directs.[59] Had he aimed at ingratiating himself with men in

---

thing, speak most correctly. . . . Now a boy is, of all wild beasts, the most difficult to manage. For by how much the more he has the fountain of prudence not yet fitted up, he becomes crafty and keen, and the most insolent of wild beasts. On this account it is necessary to bind him, as it were, with many chains. . . . For learning to read and write three years would do for a boy ten years old. But to those who are thirteen, three years for handling the lyre would be a moderate time. NOR LET IT BE LAWFUL for a father (to permit), or his son of his own act, to make his application to these studies more or less, or for more or less years than these whether desirous to learn or hating it. . . . It is meet . . . that certain festival battles may take place. . . . Let not every one be a poet on such subjects, but let him be a person not less than fifty years of age; NOR, in the next place, SUCH OF THOSE AS POSSESS POETRY AND MUSIC sufficiently in themselves, but have never done any honorable and conspicuous act, but [only] such as are good men themselves and held in honor by the state, and have been the doers of honorable deeds. (And) let the compositions of such persons be sung, even ALTHOUGH THEY MAY NOT BE NATURALLY MUSICAL. But let the decision on these matters be with the instructor of youth, and the other guardians of the laws; . . . nor let any one dare to sing a song, which has not been approved of by the guardians of the laws, who are to decide, not even if it be sweeter than the hymns of Thamyris and Orpheus." — *Laws*, **7**, 7, 14, **8**, 1, Bohn's trans. pp. 797 B, C, 808 D, 809 E – 810 A, 829 C, D.

[58] "He then, who thinks to promulgate laws for states, as to what manner citizens should live and perform their public and common duties, but of their private concerns, . . . that there should be a license for each person to live as they please each day, and no need for everything to take place by an order, . . . does not think correctly. . . . Let no one utter any song besides the public and sacred songs, . . . any more than (he would act) contrary to any other law: and let . . . the guardians of the laws, and the priests and priestesses, chastise him, who does not obey. . . . Let us then lay down this as one of the laws. . . . That a poet shall not compose anything, either beautiful or good, contrary to what is lawful and just in the state; NOR SHALL HE BE PERMITTED TO SHOW WHAT HE HAS COMPOSED to any private person, before it shall have been shown to the judges and guardians of the law, appointed for this purpose, and approved of by them. . . . It will be meet to separate the songs suited to females and males, by defining them." — *Laws*, **6**, 21, **7**, 8, 9, 10; pp. 780 A, 800 A, 801 C, D, 802 D; *Republic*, **4**, 3, 4, p. 424 B, D, Bohn's trans.

[59] An individual, who had held position near, and travelled with, the present Russian emperor, lent me, in the winter of 1840–41, a work upon education in Russia. It was in French, and, if memory serve me right, published in Poland. From notes then taken the following extracts are made: "No person shall be permitted to have a private teacher, . . . without such teacher shall first have been examined . . . by a Com-

authority his advocacy of governmental absolutism would have been apposite. Whether it resulted from an utter mistrust of man's moral nature may be a fair question. Plato's views of marriage were, as is well known, that women should be held in common, and that the parental relation should be ignored.[60] These and other of his utterances befit a lunatic or a moral idiot.[61]

In the discursive talkativeness of Plato upon multitudinous subjects there is nowhere indicated a mind competent to ORIGINATE, or even to appreciate and retain, the conception of a Creator.[62] Whether he could have originated his limited idea of Judgment as a supplement to his model Republic

---

mittee (appointed by the department of Public Instruction)." The law was one of Catharine, re-enacted. Nobles were expressly mentioned in the re-enactment as subject to its provisions. Next, . . . private teachers in families or boarding-schools were forbidden to teach anything but the course adopted in the public schools, or to make use of any other books than those pertaining to the same, in order that public and private education might harmonize with each other. The emperor even forbade the opening of private schools in localities where public ones existed.

[60] "After this enactment, . . . and the others formerly mentioned, the following, I think, comes naturally. . . . That these women be all common to all these men, and that no one woman dwell with any man privately, and that their children likewise be common; so that neither shall the parents know their own children, nor the children their parents. . . . I do not think, . . . as to its utility at least, that any one would doubt about it being a very great good to have the women and children in common, if it were but possible; but the greatest question, methinks, will be, whether it be possible or not." — *Republic*, **5**, 7, Bohn's trans. p. 457 C, D. Compare *Laws*, **5**, 10, p. 739 C.

[61] "We must unclothe then the wives of our guardians, since they are to put on virtue for clothes; . . . and the man who laughs at naked women . . . seems not rightly to know at what he laughs or why he does it." — *Republic*, **5**, 6, Bohn's trans. p. 457 A, B.

[62] **Plato** in one passage affirms the unholiness of any inquiry about the greatest God and the universe, or perhaps it should be translated the greatest God, namely, the Universe. "We say that we ought not to search after the greatest god, and the whole order of the world, nor to be busy in explaining the causes (of things); for it is not holy. It seems indeed, that, if the very contrary took place, it would take place correctly." — *Laws*, **7**, 22, p. 821 A, Bohn's trans. In the face of this, Plato in the *Laws* (**10**, 6–9, pp. 893 B–899 B) inquires at great length concerning the Universe. His assumptions and argument in this portion of his writings would, if reliable, dispense with a Creator, and prove the universe to have a self-existent soul and its component parts also to have such souls. Cicero (*De Nat. Deorum*, **1**, 12, *al.* 30) uses strong language concerning these and his other inconsistencies in regard to the divine nature.

might admit discussion, were it not for the strong probability that he must have come in contact with Jewish views.

13. Plato is recognized by his admirers and translators as an obscure writer.[63] There are at least two prominent reasons for this. Firstly, his own views are often anything but clear, and he cannot make his subject clearer to others than to himself. Secondly, he swamps it in such a sea of conversation and diverts attention by such incessant digressions, that only through pertinacity can a reader keep his main object in sight. There is yet perhaps a third reason. Plato at times may have been willing to dazzle weaklings by language, apparently learned, which he knew to be devoid of sense.

A reader conversant with French will find Le Grou's translation easier reading and more intelligible than those issued by Bohn. He should note the sense in which Plato uses the term "music,"[64] or he may entirely misapprehend him.

---

[63] The article in the **New Am. Cyclopædia** represents his style as "often needlessly and provokingly obscure." — Vol. **13**, p. 384, col. 2. **H. Davis**, in his Preface to the *Timæus*, speaks of "there being many passages in it which still in fact puzzle even the most ingenious of its commentators." — Bohn's Plato, Vol. **2**, p. 318. **H. B. Burges** mentions the *Statesman* as presenting "not a few passages to exercise and . . . baffle emendatory criticism"; and adds, "Stallbaum . . . has left little to desire in his *Prolegomena* . . . on questions that will, it is to be feared, remain forever in their present obscurity." — Bohn's Plato, Vol. **3**, p. 188. The same writer says of the *Parmenides:* "By a chain of reasoning, where subtleties assume the garb of truths, conclusions are arrived at, so as to fully justify the fear, which Socrates is here feigned to feel, that by pursuing metaphysical inquiries, he would fall into the bottomless sea of trifling. . . . Such at least seems to have been the fate of every commentator who has ventured to enter the maze of mind which Plato has with such art built up. For neither Proclus and Damascius of the olden time, nor more recently Ficinus, nor, within the last hundred years, Taylor in England, Schleiermacher and others in Germany, nor Cousin in France, have been able to understand thoroughly themselves, and to explain satisfactorily to others, what is likely to remain forever an intellectual puzzle." — Bohn's Plato, Vol. **3**, pp. 397, 398. The same writer reiterates his perplexity in his Preface to the *Philebus*, Bohn's Plato, Vol. **4**, p. 2; and again in his Preface to the *Laws* speaks of the "original Greek, where so numerous are the difficulties and so unaccountable the corruptions as to render it frequently impossible to give even a readable . . . rendering." — Bohn's Plato, Vol. **5**, p. 3.

[64] "When you say music, you mean arguments, do you not? I do." — *Republic*, **2**, 17, p. 376 E.

§ III. *Heraclitus, Predecessor of the Stoics.*

At a yet earlier date than Xenophon and Plato lived Heraclitus at Ephesus in Asia Minor, a man who in his travels must have met with Jewish teaching, and whose recorded tenets entitle him to be regarded as a predecessor of the Stoics.[65] The depression attributed to him may have been constitutional, or may have resulted from that higher ideal of life obtained among monotheists which he despaired of imparting to his countrymen.[66]

---

[65] "His philosophical creed was embodied in a work . . . *On Nature*. The most remarkable tenets of this creed were, that by the operation of a light ethereal fluid, WHICH HE DENOMINATED FIRE, all things . . . were created, and that acquiescence in the decrees of the SUPREME LAW was the great duty of man." — **Am. Cyclopædia**, art. *Heraclitus*. Compare views of Jews and Stoics in Ch. III. notes 17, 18, 31, and in the prefixed text. According to him, "Ultimately all things will return into the fire from which they proceeded." — **Smith**, *Dict. of Biog.* **2**, p. 392, col. 2. Compare Ch. III. notes 14, 15. Heraclitus "teaches a resurrection of this visible flesh in which we were born, and he knew God as the author of this resurrection." — **Philosophumena**, **9**, 10, pp. 282, 283, edit. Miller. The closing remark in regard to God is based, in the Philosophumena, on a quotation from Heraclitus, which seems to mean that "[men] will be raised up (or replaced) by [the] Being," and which mentions that there will be "guards for the awakened and the dead." — *Ibid.* Clement of Alexandria (*Protrept.* § 50) appeals to Heraclitus as reproaching idols and their worshippers for lack of perception. Compare Ps. **115**, 6; Wisd. of Sol. **15**, 15; and in the present work Ch. III. notes 9, 10.

[66] "After his return to Ephesus the chief magistracy was offered him, which, however, he transferred to his brother. He gave, as his reason for declining it, the infamous state of morals prevalent in the city, and employed himself in playing at dice with boys near the temple of Artemis, informing the passers-by that this was a more profitable occupation than to attempt the hopeless task of governing them. He appears afterwards to have become a complete recluse, rejecting even the kindnesses offered by Darius, and at last retreating to the mountains, where he lived on pot-herbs, but, after some time, he was compelled by the sickness consequent on such meagre diet to return to Ephesus, where he died. . . . He was represented in various old traditions as the contrast to Democritus, weeping over follies and frailties at which the other laughed." — **Smith**, *Dict. of Biog.* **2**, pp. 391, 392.

NOTE L.

GENESIS I. – XI.

It has been held by many, both of those who defend and of those who doubt or deny the Mosaic authorship of Genesis, that in its earlier chapters a compilation was made from two or more documents, one, or one set of which, designated the Deity as Elohim, translated in our common version God, the other as Jehovah, or Jehovah Elohim, translated in our common version Lord, or Lord God. The following attempt at arrangement of the documents in parallel columns was made about twenty years ago. To facilitate comparison some portions of it are now omitted.

In five instances (ch. **3**, 1 – 5; **4**, part of 25; **5**, part of 29; **7**, 12; **9**, 27) the compiler seems to have introduced into one narrative a peculiarity borrowed from the other. These have been printed in brackets as a means of arresting attention. Possibly the reader may improve details of the arrangement. A table of differences is here subjoined, as an aid to study.

A.	B.
In this column: —	**In this column: —**
The Deity is called God.	The Deity is called **Jehovah** God.
Creation lasts six days.	Creation not apportioned into days.
The seventh day is hallowed.	The seventh day is not mentioned.
Man and woman are created simultaneously, after fowls and animals.	Man first formed, then animals, and yet later woman.
Eden is not mentioned.	Account of Eden.
The flood begins in the year 600, 2d month, 17th day; abates after 150 days; ends in 601, 2d month, 27th day, having lasted 1 year and 10 days.	The flood lasts (40 and 7 and 7) 54 days; it ends in the year 601, 1st month, 1st day.
Two animals of all kinds, clean and unclean, are saved.	Seven [pair] of clean animals, two of unclean, and seven [pair] of fowls are saved.
The first-born is Seth.	The first-born is Cain.
Abel is not mentioned.	Abel is murdered.
Lamech is a descendant of Seth.	Lamech is a descendant of Cain.
No sacrifice is mentioned.	Noah offers sacrifice.
Babel not mentioned.	Account of Babel.

A.

1. 1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. 2 ... 3 And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. 4 And God saw the light, that *it was* good: and God divided the light from the darkness. 5 And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and morning were the first day.

6 And God said, Let there be a firmament ... 7 And God made the firmament ... 8 And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and morning were the second day.

9 And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together ... 10 And God called the dry *land* Earth; and the ... waters called he Seas; and God saw that *it was* good. 11 And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, *and* the fruit-tree ... 12 ... and God saw that *it was* good. 13 And the evening and morning were the third day.

14 And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven ... 15 And let them be for lights in the ... heaven ... 16 And God made two great lights; ... *he made* the stars also. 17 And God set them in the firmament of the heaven ... 18 ... and God saw that *it was* good. 19 And the evening and morning were the fourth day.

20 And God said, Let the waters bring forth ... fowl *that* may fly ... 21 And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, ... and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that *it was* good. 22 And God blessed them, saying, Be

B.

(2, 4.) THESE ARE THE GENERATIONS OF THE HEAVENS AND OF THE EARTH.

... In the day that **Jehovah** God made the earth and the heavens. 5 ... **Jehovah** God had not caused it to rain upon the earth ... 6 ... 7 And **Jehovah** God formed man *of* the dust of the ground ...

8 And **Jehovah** God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man ... 9 And out of the ground made **Jehovah** God to grow every tree ... the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil ... 10 ... 11 ... 12 ... 13 ... 14 ...

15 And **Jehovah** God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden ... 16 And **Jehovah** God commanded the man ... 17 ... of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat ...

18 And **Jehovah** God said, *It is* not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an helpmeet for him. 19 And out of the ground **Jehovah** God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought *them* unto Adam ... 20 ... but for Adam there was not found an helpmeet for him. 21 And **Jehovah** God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam ... and he took one of his ribs ... 22 And the rib, which **Jehovah** God had taken from man, made he a woman ... 23 ... 24 ... 25 ...

3. 1 [Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which **Jehovah** God had made. And he said unto

A.

fruitful ... 23 And the evening and morning were the fifth day.

24 And God said, Let the earth bring forth ... cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth ... 25 And God made the beast of the earth ... and cattle ... and everything that creepeth ; ... and God saw that *it was* good. 26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness ... 27 So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him ; male and female created he them. 28 And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful ... 29 And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb...and every ... fruit of a tree yielding seed to you it shall be for meat. 30 ... 31 And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, *it was* very good. And the evening and morning were the sixth day. **2.** 1 Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

2 And on the seventh day God ended his work ... 3 And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it : because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.

(5, 1.) THIS IS THE BOOK OF THE GENERATIONS OF ADAM.

In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him ; 2 Male and female created he them ; and blessed them, and called their name Adam ...

3 And Adam ... begat *a son* ... and called his name Seth. 4 ... 5 ...

B.

the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? 2 And the woman said unto the serpent... 3 ... of the fruit of the tree which *is* in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it ... lest ye die. 4 And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die : 5 For God doth know that in the day ye eat ... then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.]

6 And when the woman saw that the tree *was* good for food ... she took ... and gave also unto her husband with her ; and he did eat. 7 ... 8 And they heard the voice of **Jehovah** God walking in the garden ; ... and Adam and his wife hid themselves from .. **Jehovah** God ... 9 And **Jehovah** God called unto Adam, ... Where *art* thou ? 10 ... 11 ... Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat ? 12 And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest *to be* with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. 13 And **Jehovah** God said unto the woman, What *is* this *that* thou hast done ? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat. 14 And **Jehovah** God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou *art* cursed ... 15 ... 16 ... 17 ... 18 ... 19 ... 20 ... 21 Unto Adam also and to his wife did **Jehovah** God make coats of skins, and clothed them.

22 And **Jehovah** God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us ... and now, lest he ... take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever : 23 Therefore **Jehovah** God sent him forth from the garden of Eden ... 24 ...

4. 1 And Adam knew Eve his wife ; and she conceived, and

A.

6 And Seth ... begat Enos : 7 ... 8 ...

9 And Enos ... begat Cainan: 10 ... 11 ...

12 And Cainan ... begat Mahalaleel : 13 ... 14 ...

15 And Mahalaleel...begat Jared : 16 ... 17 ...

18 And Jared ... begat Enoch : 19 ... 20 ...

21 And Enoch ... begat Methuselah : 22 ... Enoch walked with God ... 23 And all the days of Enoch were 365 years : 24 And Enoch walked with God : and he *was* not ; for God took him.

25 And Methuselah ... begat Lamech : 26 ... 27 ...

28 And Lamech ... begat a son : 29 And he called his name Noah,

[Saying, This *same* shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which **Jehovah** hath cursed.]

32 And Noah ... begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

6. 1 And ... 2 ... the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they *were* fair ; and they took them wives of all which they chose.

(6, 9.) THESE ARE THE GENERATIONS OF NOAH.

Noah was a just man *and* ... walked with God. 10 ... 11 The earth also was corrupt before God ... 12 And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt ... 13 And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come ; ... I will destroy them with the earth.

B.

bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from **Jehovah**. 2 And she again bare his brother Abel ... 3 And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought ... an offering unto **Jehovah**. 4 And Abel, he also brought ... And **Jehovah** had respect unto Abel and to his offering : 5 ... 6 And **Jehovah** said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth ? ... 7 ... 8 ... Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.

9 And **Jehovah** said unto Cain, Where *is* Abel thy brother ? ... 10 ... 11 ... 12 ... 13 And Cain said unto **Jehovah**, My punishment *is* greater than I can bear. 14 ... 15 And **Jehovah** said unto him, Therefore, whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven-fold. And **Jehovah** set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him. 16 And Cain went out from the presence of **Jehovah** ...

17 And Cain knew his wife ; and she conceived, and bare Enoch ... 18 And unto Enoch was born Irad : and Irad begat Mehujael : and Mehujael begat Methusael : and Methusael begat Lamech.

19 ... 20 ... 21 ... 22 ... 23 ... 24 ... 25 And Adam knew his wife again ; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth :

[For God, *said she*, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.]

26 And to Seth, there was born a son, Enos : then began men to call upon the name of **Jehovah**.

6. 3 And **Jehovah** said, My spirit shall not always abide in man ... 4 ...

A.

14 Make thee an ark of gopher wood ... 15 ... 16 ... 17 ... 18 ... 19 And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every *sort* shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep *them* alive with thee; they shall be male and female. 20 ... 21 ... 22 Thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded him ... **7.** 6 ...

7 And Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him ... 8 Of clean beasts, and of beasts that *are* not clean, and of fowls, and of every thing that creepeth upon the earth, 9 There went in two and two unto Noah into the ark, the male and the female, as God had commanded Noah.

11 In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened.

12 [And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.]

13 In the selfsame day entered Noah ... 14 ... 15 And they went in ... two and two of all flesh ... 16 ... male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him: 18 ... 19 ... 20 ... 21 ... 22 ... 23 ... 24 And the waters prevailed upon the earth 150 days.

8. 1 And God remembered Noah ... 2 ... 3 ... and after ... 150 days the waters were abated. 4 ... 5 And the waters decreased continually ... 14 And in the second month, on the 27th day, ... was the earth dried.

15 And God spake unto Noah, saying, 16 Go forth of the ark ... 17 ... 18 And Noah went forth ... 19 ...

B.

5 And **Jehovah** saw that the wickedness of man *was* great ... 6 And it repented **Jehovah** that he had made man ... 7 And **Jehovah** said, I will destroy man whom I have created ... 8 But Noah found grace in the eyes of **Jehovah**.

7. 1 And **Jehovah** said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark ... 2 Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female; and of beasts that *are* not clean by two, the male and his female. 3 Of fowls also of the air by sevens, the male and the female ... 4 ... and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights ... 5 And Noah did according unto all that **Jehovah** commanded him. 10 ... 16 And **Jehovah** shut him in. 17 And the flood was forty days upon the earth ...

8. 6 And it came to pass at the end of forty days, that Noah ... 7 ... 8 ... sent forth a dove ... 9 ... and she returned unto him ... 10 And he stayed yet other seven days; and again he sent forth the dove ... 11 And the dove came in to him in the evening; and, lo, in her mouth *was* an olive leaf plucked off; so Noah knew that the waters were abated ... 12 And he stayed yet other seven days; and sent forth the dove; which returned not again ... 13 And it came to pass in the 601st year, in the first *month*, the first *day* of the month, the waters were dried up ...

20 And Noah builded an altar unto **Jehovah**; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. 21 And **Je-**

A.

9. 1 And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5 ... 6 Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man. 7 ...

8 And God spake unto Noah ... 9 ... behold, I establish my covenant with you ... 10 ... 11 ... 12 ... 13 ... 14 ... 15 ... 16 ... the bow shall be in the cloud; ... that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature ... 17 And God said unto Noah, This *is* the token of the covenant ...

18 And the sons of Noah, that went forth of the ark, were Shem, and Ham, and Japheth ... 19 ... 28 ... 29 ...

(11, 10.) THESE ARE THE GENERATIONS OF SHEM.

Shem ... begat Arphaxad: ... 11 ... 12 And Arphaxad :... begat Salah : 13 ... 14 And Salah ... begat Eber : 15 ... 16 And Eber ... begat Peleg : 17 ... 18 And Peleg ... begat Reu : 19 ... 20 And Reu ... begat Serug : 21 ... 22 And Serug ... begat Nahor : 23 ... 24 And Nahor ... begat Terah: 25 ... 26 And Terah ... begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran.

NOW THESE ARE THE GENERATIONS OF TERAH.

27 Terah begat Abram ... 28 ... 29 ... 30 ... 31 And Terah took Abram ... and they came unto Haran, and dwelt there. 32 ...

B.

hovah smelt a sweet savor; and **Jehovah** said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake ... 22 ...

9. 20 ... 21 ... 22 ... 23 ... 24 Noah ... 25 ... 26 ... said, Blessed *be* **Jehovah** God of Shem ...

27 [God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.]

(10, 1.) NOW THESE ARE THE GENERATIONS OF THE SONS OF NOAH.

Shem, Ham, and Japheth ... 2 The sons of Japheth ... 3 ... 4 ... 5 ...

6 And the sons of Ham : Cush ... 7 ... 8 And Cush begat Nimrod ... 9 He was a mighty hunter before **Jehovah**, wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before **Jehovah**. 10 ... 11 ... 12 ... 13 ... 14 ... 15 ... 16 ... 17 ... 18 ... 19 ... 20 ...

21 Unto Shem ... were *children* born. 22 ... 23 ... 24 ... 25 ... 26 ... 27 ... 28 ... 29 ... 30 ... 31 ...

32 These are the families of the sons of Noah ...

11. 1 And the whole earth ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower ... 5 And **Jehovah** came down to see the city and the tower ... 6 And **Jehovah** said ... 7 ... let us go down, and there confound their language ... 8 So **Jehovah** scattered them ... 9 Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because **Jehovah** did there confound the language of all the earth; and from thence did **Jehovah** scatter them abroad ...

NOTE M.

LOCALITY OF GREEK CULTURE.

Smith's Biographical Dictionary furnishes the following professional names, between B. C. 400 and A. D. 400, of persons who lived not farther west than Greece or Egypt.[1] The investigation (intrusted to other eyes and which the author could not test) may be, and is doubtless, imperfect; yet its results are subjoined in the hope of lightening labor for some one else.

Persons of uncertain origin are designated by a mark of interrogation; natives of Greece proper by italics. Such of the latter as studied or resided in Asia Minor, Syria, or Egypt have an asterisk affixed to their names.

Asia Minor was a larger country than Syria or North Egypt. Its secular literature also has perished to a less extent than that of the other two.[2] Both of these causes may explain why we still have a larger list from it than from both the others of literary and scientific men. Whether its medical prominence claim other explanation may deserve scrutiny. Of the physicians hereinafter named ninety-eight are of uncertain origin; seventy-four came from Asia Minor; and but fifteen from Syria and North Egypt. To Syrians, however, should be added Luke, not mentioned in Smith.

Astronomers. — Apollonius of Phrygia, Apollonius of Caria, Aristarchus, Aristyllus (?), Callippus, Cleomedes (?), Conon, Eratosthenes, Eudoxus, Geminus, Hipparchus, Hypsicles, Ptolemæus, Sosigenes (?), Theodosius, Theon.

Mathematicians. — Apollonius, Archimedes, Ctesibius (mech-

---

[1] Greek culture existed in North Africa, Sicily, South Italy, and in that section of Gaul where we afterwards find a settlement of Christians, some of them certainly from Asia. In most cases, however, we could only reason inferentially as to whether this culture came from Greece or from more monotheistic lands.

[2] Asia Minor was ruled more immediately by the Senate; Syria and North Egypt, by the emperor (see p. 184, note 115). The latter two countries were more frequently than the former intrusted to members of the popular party, a party whose literature suffered seriously during the ascendency of its opponents. Much of Syrian literature was moreover in a language unlikely to be copied or read outside of its own borders.

anician), Diophantus (?), *Dositheus*, Eucleides (Euclid), Heron (mechanician), Marinus, Menelaus, Onosander (?), Pappus, Philon (mechanician), Polyænus, Strabo (geographer), Theodosius, Theon.

Architects. — Andronicus, Chersiphron, Deinocrates, Demetrius (?), Menalippus (?), Nicon, Parmenion (?), *Phileus*, *Philon*, Priscus, Sostratus, Tryphon.

Grammarians and Rhetoricians. — Abron, Agatharchides, Alexander Pelop., Amerias, Ammonius, *Amphicrates*,* Andromachus (?), Aphthonius, Apollodorus (two), *Apollodorus*,* Apollonius, *Apollonius*,* Apollonius Dysc., Apollonius Molon., Arcadius, Aristarchus, Aristeides P. Ælius, Aristocles (two), Aristodemus, Aristonicus, *Artemon*, Asclepiades (three), Athenæus (?), Atticus Dion., *Atticus*,* Basilicus, Baton, Bemarchius, Caianus, Callias, Callimachus, Callinicus, Callistratus (?), Carystius, Castor, Caucalus, Cestius Pius, Chæremon, Chrestus, Conon (?), Crates, Damianus, Daphitas, Demetrius (three), Dexippus, Dexippus P. Heren. (?), Dias, Didymus (two), Didymus (the younger), Diodorus, Diodorus Zonas, Diodorus (the younger), Diogenes, Diogenianus (two), Dionysius (eight), Diophanes, Diotimus, Diotrephes, Diphilus, Dorion (?), *Epaphroditus*,* Epiceleustus, Epicurus, *Epiphanius*, Epitherses, Eudemus (?), Eudæmon, Eulogius Favon., Eunapius, *Euphorion*,* Euphorion, *Euphronides*, *Eupithius*, Eurycles (?), Evodianus, Fronto, Genethlius, Glaucon, Gnipho, M. Antonin., Heliodorus, Helladius, Helladius Besant., Hellanicus, Heracleides (two), Heracleon, Hermagoras (two), Hermarchus, Hermippus, Hermocrates, Hermogenes, Hermon (?), Herodianus Ælius, Hesychius, Hierocles, Himerius, Homerus, Homerus Sellius (?), Horapollo, Horus (?), Isidorus, Leonidas, Lesbonax (two), Libanius, Lollianus, Longus, Lupercus, Lycophron, Lynceus, Lysimachus, Maior, Melampodes (?), Menander, Menecles, Minucianus, *Minucianus*, Mœris (?), Neoptolemus, Nicander, Nicias, Nicomedes, Nicostratus, Obrimus (?), Orion, Palæphatus, Palamedes (?), *Palladius*, *Pammenes*, Pamphilus, Panætius, Parmeniscus (?), Parthenius, Pasicrates, Paulus (two), Phanias, Philemon (two [?), Philetas, Philiscus, Philostratus (?), *Philostratus*, Philoxenus, Platonius (?), Plution (?), Polemon Antonin., Pollio Asin. (of Tralles), Pollux, Polycrates (?), Pompilius (of Syria), Potamon, Praxiphanes, Proæresius, Probus (of Berytus), Proclus, Proclus Eutuch., Ptolemæus (four), Ptolemæus Pindar., Rhianus, Rufinus (of Antioch), Sabinus, Scopelianus, *Secundus*, Seleucus, Serapion, Simaristus (?), *Sosibius*, Sostratus, Tauriscus (?), Telephus (two), Theagenes, Themistius, Theodectes, Theodorus (two), Theodosius, *Theodotus*, Theon Ælius, Tiberius (?), Timarchus (two [?), Tryphiodorus, Tryphon, Tyrannion (two), Victorinus Marius, Xenarchus, Xenocles, Zenobius (?), Zenodotus (two), Zenon, Zoilus.

Physicians and Surgeons. (compare Chap. XIII. note 11). — Ablabius (?), Adamantius (Jew), Ælianus (?), Ælius, Æschines, Æschrion, *Agathemerus*, *Agathinus*,* Alexander Phil., Alexander, *Alexius*, Ammonius Lithot., Anaxilaus, *Andreas*,* Androcydes (?), Andron (?), Andronicus (?), Antigonus (?), Antiochus (two [?) An-

tiphanes (?), Antonius (?), Antyllus (?), Apollonides (?), Apollonius Antioch., Apollonius Arch., Apollonius Biblas, Apollonius Citien., Apollonius Claud., Apollonius Cyprius, Apollonius Empir., Apollonius Heroph., Apollonius Memph., Apollonius Mus., Apollonius Ophis, Apollonius Pergam., *Apollonius Pitan.* (?), Apollonius Tarsen., Apollophanes, Apsyrtus, Aratus, *Archagathus*, Archibius (?), Archigenes (?), Aretæus (?), Aristarchus (?), Aristion (?), Aristogenes (two), Artemidorus (?), Artemidorus Corn., *Asclapo*, Asclepiades, Athenæus, *Baccheius*,* Botrys (?), Cæsarius, Callianax (?), Calliceles (?), Calligenes (?), Callimachus (?), Callimorphus (?), Capito (?), Cassius (?), Celsus A. Cornel.[3] (?), Chariton (?), Charixenus (?), Chrysermus (?), Chrysippus (three [?), Cleophantus (two [?), Codratus (a Christian martyr), Critobulus (?), Critodemus, Ctesias, Demetrius (three), Demosthenes Phil. (?), Dexippus, Diagoras (?), Dieuches (?), *Diocles*, Diodorus (?), Diodotus (?), Diogenes (?), Diomedes, Dionysius, Diophantes, Dioscorides Pedac., Dioscorides Phacas, Diphilus, *Dorotheus*, Epictetus (?), Erasistratus (?), Eudoxus, Eugenianus (?), Eunomos (?), Euphorbus (?), Euphorion (?), Eustathius (?), Eustochius (?), Evax, Evenor (?), Galenus, Glaucias (?), Glaucus (?), Gorgias (two [?), Hegetor (?), Heracleides (two [?), Heraclianus (?), Heras (?), Hermogenes (two [?), Herodotus (two [?), Herophilus, Hicesius (?), Hippocrates (?),[4] Iphicianus (?), Ionicus (?), Julianus, Leonidas, Leontius, Lucius, Lycus of Macedonia, Lysimachus, Magnus (four), Marinus, Medius, Meges, Menemachus (?), Menodorus (?), Menodotus, Metrodorus (two), Mnaseas (?), Mnemon (?), Niceratus (?), *Nicias*, Nicomachus (?), Nileus (?), Nymphodorus (?), Olymnius (?), Olympus (?), Orestes (?), Oribasius, Palladius (?), Pantaleon, Papylus, Pasicrates, Pausanias (?), Pelops, *Philagrius*,* Philagrius (?), Philinus (?), *Philippus*,* Philippus (two [?), Philon, Philon (?), Philonides, *Philotas*,* Philoxenus (?), Philumenus (?), Polyarchus (?), Polyeides (?), Praxagoras, Priscianus Theo. (?), Rufus Ephesius, Sabinus (?), Satyrus (?), Serapion, Sextus Empiricus (?), Sopolis (?), Soranus (four), Sostratus (?), Straton, Stratonicus, Thalelæus, Themison, Theodorus (?), Theodotus (three), Thessalus, Theudas (?), Xenocrates (?), Xenophon (two), Zenobius, Zenon (three), Zeuxis, Zopyrus.

A collection of fragments from Greek historians has been published by Didot at Paris, in four large 8vo volumes. Of the writers contained therein only one tenth, or thereabouts, came from Greece.

No city of Greece proper seems to have had any public library. This is a strong reason for discrediting that country as the seat of Greek learning.

---

[3] Celsus spent a portion of his life at Rome.

[4] Arabian accounts say that Hippocrates studied near Damascus.

ADDENDA.

Page 18, note 3. — **Ernesti,** in his Index to Cicero's Latin, states under *Divinus*, that the Ancients classified dialectics and morals as human concerns; the events of nature as divine ones.

The gods — though deemed indifferent to morality and sensitive almost exclusively to offences against themselves — were thought occasionally to notice what contravened sentiment. Thus when the father of Œdipus exposed his infant son, the gods cared nothing for his crime; but when the son, escaping destruction, married in mature life through ignorance his own mother, they sent pestilence on his people.

Page 203, line 9 of note. — The point of the allusion to Plato is that his favoritism for the ruling class (see pp. 576, 577) rendered it difficult for patricians to gainsay his authority.

Page 361, note 6. — Persecutions under Marc Antonine must have been largely due to the political clique who controlled him, and who wished that the result of their own robbery and misrule should be attributed to anger of the gods against Christians.

Page 384, note 40. — Two of our Missionaries to Japan, **M. C. Harris** and **C. S. Eby,** inform me that the Japanese language also has no word for conscience. The latter writes me: "We have to say 'conscience' by a circumlocution, and often the English word itself is incorporated into speech or literature for the educated."

"The subject of conscience is entirely new to them [inhabitants of the Sandwich Islands], and deeply interesting. They have no word for it in their language, but they readily perceive that there is such a faculty." Letter of **Richard Armstrong** to Dr. Wayland, in Memoir of **Francis Wayland,** Vol. **1,** p. 386.

Page 390, note 3. — "The Zulus . . . worship their ancestors. . . . There is no word in the Zulu language which is equivalent to the word God." **Josiah Tyler** in "New York Observer," quoted in "New York Tribune," Dec. 11, 1881.

Page 564. — The **Penny Cyclopædia,** in its article on Gibbon (Vol. **11,** p. 212, col. 2) says: "His acquaintance with the Byzantine historians is said by those who have studied the subject to be superficial." The same charge applies to his acquaintance with western writers. His treatment of slavery in his second chapter utterly ignores the conflict of parties which has been stated on pp. 86–89, and he obviously regards the ameliorated slave law of Hadrian as due to kindlier feeling of slaves towards their masters, whereas it was occasioned by public indignation at recent atrocities of the latter.

ADDENDA.

to 8th edit.

Page 18, note 3. — **Ernesti**, in his Index to Cicero's Latin, states under *Divinus*, that the Ancients classified dialectics and morals as human concerns; the events of nature as divine ones.

The gods — though deemed indifferent to morality and sensitive almost exclusively to offences against themselves — were thought occasionally to notice what contravened sentiment. Thus when the father of Œdipus exposed his infant son, the gods cared nothing for his crime; but when the son, escaping destruction, married in mature life through ignorance his own mother, they sent pestilence on his people.

Page 203, line 9 of note. — The point of the allusion to Plato is that his favoritism for the ruling class (see pp. 576, 577) rendered it difficult for patricians to gainsay his authority.

Page 361, note 6. — Persecutions under Marc Antonine must have been largely due to the political clique who controlled him, and who wished that the result of their own robbery and misrule should be attributed to anger of the gods against Christians.

Page 381, note 27 a. — **Rabbi Judah** said: "He that teacheth not his son a trade does as if he taught him to be a thief." — **Lightfoot**, *Works*, **3**, 227, London edit. 1822.

The **Testament** edited by **Koppe**, in its note on Acts **18**, 3, gives the following: "Maimonides, Tract. Talmud. Tor. c. **1**, § 9. Most scholars have pursued some handicraft, lest they should need the help of others." Also, "Berachot. Babyl. fol. **63**, 2: Every one should teach his son some honorable and readily pursued occupation."

Page 384, note 40. — Two of our Missionaries to Japan, **M. C. Harris** and **C. S. Eby,** inform me that the Japanese language also has no word for conscience. The latter writes me: "We have to say 'conscience' by a circumlocution, and often the English word itself is incorporated into speech or literature for the educated."

"The subject of conscience is entirely new to them [inhabitants of the Sandwich Islands], and deeply interesting. They have no word for it in their language, but they readily perceive that there is such a faculty." — Letter of **Richard Armstrong** to Dr. Wayland, in Memoir of **Francis Wayland,** Vol. **1,** p. 386.

Two scholars in Sanskrit have kindly furnished me the following:—

Prof. W. D. Whitney says: "As regards the occurrence of a term corresponding to *conscience* in the more modern languages of India I cannot speak with confidence; but no such term is to be presumed in them if wanting in Sanskrit; and it is so wanting. The Sanskrit has terms by which, in rendering English into Sanskrit, an intelligible idea of our conscience can be conveyed; but the language has no real word of its own in use for the purpose. In the first verses of the second chapter of Manu, 'self-satisfaction' is made one of the competent grounds of action; and it is said elsewhere that what one feels no shame in doing, and is willing to have every one know, is an approved act. Of course, one must be careful about inferring a deficiency of control by conscience from the absence of a distinct name for it."

Prof. F. Max Müller writes me: "It is generally said that there is no word for conscience in Sanskrit, and in one sense it is true. . . . The shasters express what we mean by conscience in various ways, which it would take too long to explain. The simplest is, *âtma*-santushti, self-satisfaction, and *âtma*-santâga, self-burning, or pain. According to Manu this âtma-santushti is one of the recognized authorities for dharma, or law."

The fact that communities endowed with conscience should have no specific term whereby to designate it, implies that it cannot hold among them that authoritative

position which it does among monotheists. In the canonical books of the Old Testament its absence is supplied by a monitor of equal authority, namely, the sense of moral responsibility to God. See note 9 on pages 21, 22. Probably this sense of responsibility was an important agent in necessitating a term for it, since such a term is found in the Apocrypha, Wis. of Sol. **17**, 11; Ecc. **14**, 2; 2d Mac. **6**, 11.

Page 390, note 3. — "The Zulus . . . worship their ancestors. . . . There is no word in the Zulu language which is equivalent to the word God." — **Josiah Tyler**, in "New York Observer," quoted in "New York Tribune," Dec. 11, 1881.

Page 564. — The **Penny Cyclopædia**, in its article on Gibbon (Vol. **11**, p. 212, col. 2) says: "His acquaintance with the Byzantine historians is said by those who have studied the subject to be superficial." The same charge applies to his acquaintance with western writers. His treatment of slavery in his second chapter utterly ignores the conflict of parties which has been stated on pp. 86–89, and he obviously regards the ameliorated slave law of Hadrian as due to kindlier feeling of slaves towards their masters, whereas it was occasioned by public indignation at recent atrocities of the latter.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01195 4213